This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

JOURNAL

OF

SACRED LITERATURE.

EDITED BY JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.

VOLUME V.

LONDON:
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.,
STATIONERS' HALL COURT.
OLIVER AND BOYD, EDINBURGH; AND J. ROBERTSON,
GRAFTON STREET, DUBLIN.

1850.

Digitized by Google

17655-

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

London: Printed by WILLIAM CLOWES and Sons, Stamford Street.

Digitized by Google

THE

JOURNAL

OF

SACRED LITERATURE.

No. IX.—JANUARY, 1850.

ANTAR.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCRIPTURE FROM THE ANCIENT BEDOUIN ROMANCE OF THAT NAME.

THE extent to which the usages and customs of Scripture may be illustrated from the existing habits and practices of the Arab tribes, has been of late years abundantly shown. The reason of this is, that a habit and form of life which is among other nations a state of transition only, has become among the Arabians, in accordance with the prophecy by which their peculiar destiny was indicated, a fixed condition of existence. Such as they now are, they became at an early period of their history; and the lapse of time, which has broken other nations to pieces, and shaken them from land to land, finds the Ishmaelite still 'in the presence of all his brethren,' in the country where history, four thousand years ago, first set him down, and with the substantive habits, tastes, customs, and manners of his remotest ancestors.

Still, it is not right to say, as cursory observers are apt to do, that there have been *no* changes. It is morally impossible for any people—even of one blood and of one land—to pass through a long series of ages without some change. Mohammedanism itself was a great change—the effect of which in modifying the habits of the people, has never yet perhaps been truly estimated by European writers. If therefore we find the present usages of the Arabian tribes supplying such large materials for the illustration of Scripture, we may expect this source to be the more productive the farther we can go back, and especially if we can

 revert

Digitized by Google

revert to a period anterior in date to the greatest modifying influence to which the ideas, customs, and sentiments of this great and ancient people have ever yet been subject.

Under these views, we have often felt surprise that the old Bedouin romance of 'Antar'—which professes to describe, and essentially does describe, the manners of the Arabian tribes of the age anterior to the appearance of Mohammed—should not have been laid under contribution by any illustrator of Scripture, unless in some of the Notes of the 'Pictorial Bible,' and in other works by the same writer. It must indeed be admitted that the materials lie involved with the story in such a shape, that it requires much experience and some actual knowledge of the people, to recognize their fitness for this interesting service, together with considerable patience to pick them out and apply them to use. To this it may be owing that this rich source of Biblical illustration has been thus overlooked, while books of modern travel have been drained even to the lees.

It is our present object to indicate by some specimens, the nature of the illustrations which may thus be obtained. But it may first be proper to furnish the reader with some notion of the work by which they are supplied. This is drawn chiefly from two communications from the pen of M. Von Hammer, the first of which appeared in the *Mines de l'Orient*, in 1802, and the other in the 'New Monthly Magazine' for 1820; and from the Introduction which Mr. Terrick Hamilton[a] has prefixed to his translation of the first portion of this romance.

As all the Arabian bibliographical authorities observe a profound silence respecting the author of 'Antar,' we can only appeal to the internal evidence furnished by the work itself. As Assmai, one of the most distinguished geniuses who flourished in the courts of the khalifs Harun and Mamun, which were so propitious to poetry and all the sciences, is mentioned throughout, and almost in every leaf as the first author, there can be little doubt that this is so far correct. But, besides him, frequent mention is made of two other persons as authorities, as relators of the history of Antar, viz. Ibn Obeide and Dschohaina, the son of Ghailem, from Yemen, both contemporaries of Assmai, and well esteemed, like himself, at the court of Mamun, the great patron of learning and learned men.

It can scarcely be doubted but that Assmai is the first and principal author of this celebrated and admired romance; but the epoch of the reign under which it was composed is not so ex-

[a] Formerly secretary to the English embassy at Constantinople, and brother of Mr. W. Hamilton, author of the *Ægyptiaca*—a work of great value until partly superseded by the more complete researches of Wilkinson and others.

pressly

Digitized by Google

pressly stated in the work as the name of the author; and the usual dedication to the khalif, by whose leave it was composed, or to whom it was presented, is wanting. Yet Von Hammer judges that, from a distinguishing characteristic of the hero, and from what Arabian history relates of the birth of Mamun, it may be decided with some degree of certainty that 'Antar' was not composed either under the government of Harun, as Mr. Hamilton supposes, or that of Amin, but in the reign of Mamun, and on his account. These are circumstances which show that this work must be ascribed rather to the later than the earlier part of the author's life; and that the court of Mamun, far more than even that of Harun, was as the fairy palace of the poets and reciters of tales, who waited the whole day through before the curtain, or outside the hall of audience, to be ready, when the khalif clapped his hands to summon them in, to entertain him with poems and tales. These facts, taken together, do of themselves give some probability to the opinion expressed as to the period to which the work belongs; and it is much strengthened by the internal evidence of a singular and characteristic feature common to the histories of Antar and of Mamun, as far as certainty can be obtained without express authorities. Antar, the heroic author of one of the seven poems suspended to the Kaaba, to which the Arabians paid, as to the holy house itself, honours almost sacred, by reverence and prostration, honouring in them the work of poetic genius as the fruit of heavenly inspiration—was, as we know from historical sources, the son of a female negro slave, not born in regular marriage; and, in the same manner, Mamun was not the son of his father Harun's consort, Zobeide, who was of royal blood, but of a female negro slave. It is natural that so singular a descent should afford the wits of those days materials enough for satire and malicious jests; and that if, at a later period, when the son of the negro slave rose to supreme power, the wits and epigrammatists, for fear of losing their heads, might repress the licence of their tongues, yet this compelled silence could not wholly obliterate the memory of the true descent of the khalif. It was therefore a fine and happy idea of Assmai, to connect the memory of the descent of the son of the negro slave, invested with the robe of the khalifs, with that of the highest honours of eloquence and valour, by a reference to Antar, the father of knighthood and the first Arabian poet of the golden age before Mohammed.

The descent of Mamun from the negro slave, which could neither be denied nor glossed over, would appear in a much fairer and more favourable light, when compared with Antar's descent from a negro bondwoman, which was also a known historical fact. For Mamun, though the son of a slave of the harem, and

Digitized by Google

inheriting the hue and the ugliness of his mother, was, however, as lawfully begotten as if he had been the son of any one of the seven hundred beauties of Harun's harem. With Antar the case was very different. He was the fruit of an altogether illicit intercourse—a sort of intercourse with a captured slave, which allowed the paternity only to be determined by the likeness of the child to the father. This was allowed in the ages before Islam, as the third and lowest form of marriage; but it was altogether forbidden by Mohammed, and was therefore regarded as illicit and abominable in the time of Mamun, when this romance is assumed to have been composed. If, therefore, even this kind of descent from a negro slave could not deprive Antar of the immortal glory acquired by valour and eloquence; if, by the might of his sword and the energy of his language, he reduced envy and censure to silence, and proceeded without interruption towards the great goal of lasting honours, and happily reached it—how welcome must the narrative of his life and heroic deeds be to the khalif whose obscure descent from a negro slave, exposed to manifold satire, was so splendidly veiled by the great qualities of his character, and by his high talents for government, that his reign became the most brilliant epoch of poetry and of the abstruse sciences—the golden age of the khalifate. This coincidence of descent from a negro slave, which was common to the greatest hero before Islam, and the greatest patron of the sciences in Islam, namely, the Bedouin knight Antar, and the Abasside khalif Mamun, may be regarded as deciding, with much probability, the time when Assmai, the most esteemed of the geniuses who flourished at the court of Harun, Amin, and Mamun, wrote this romance.

Assmai, distinguished, not less by his talents than by the favour of the khalif, among the poets at the court of Mamun, drew, therefore, in this work the picture of the golden age of the Arabians before Mohammed, which was hardly two hundred years anterior to the time in which he lived. The two most brilliant periods in the Arabian history are—the time immediately before Mohammed, and the reign of the first seven khalifs of the family of Abbas. The first period includes the fairest days of Arabian freedom and independence; in the second period the empire of the Arabians had attained the height of greatness and power. In both periods the intellectual genius of the Arabians attained its palmiest state, and received its highest honours.

This golden age of their language and poetry is called by the Arabs the 'time of ignorance,' merely in reference to the want of that religious faith and knowledge which they suppose Mohammed to have brought. And, indeed, setting aside the flourishing state of

Digitized by Google

of poetry, the age immediately preceding Mohammed may be justly called the age of ignorance, in comparison of the age of the highest attainments in science under the first seven khalifs of the family of Abbas, and especially under the seventh of them Mamun, during whose reign the learning of the Arabians was at its height. The history of Antar is therefore a romance, the hero of which lived in the golden age of Arabian poetry immediately preceding Mohammed, while the author of it wrote in the golden age of science and learning among the Arabians under Mamun. The court poet Assmai described the heroic deeds of the Bedouin poet Antar; the brightest genius at the court of Mamun did homage in this romance to the first poetic genius before Mohammed, and indirectly to the khalif himself; for the crown of honour and glory which Assmai wove for the dark brow of Antar shed some of its lustre upon that of the sovereign: and the splendour of almost sacred reverence with which the Arabians before Mohammed honoured the works of their greatest national poets, was reflected upon the poetical biographer.

Thus the history of Antar is the picture of the manners, of the spirit, and the character of the most brilliant epoch before Mohammed, described in the most brilliant period of the khalifate; a picture of Bedouin chivalry, drawn at the court of the khalif, and is, therefore, as well through the spirit of the hero, as the age of the author, deeply imbued with the vivifying energy of chivalry and poetry—such as, before and after Mohammed, it issued from the desert, awing and subjugating nations—such as, treading underfoot effeminate nations and unstable thrones, it penetrated through Asia and Africa to the Pillars of Hercules, and breathed the southern spirit of romantic poetry and chivalrous honour through Spain into the heart of Europe. Hence appears the great difference between the romance of 'Antar' and the 'Tales of the Thousand and One Nights,' and others of the same order. Mohammed prohibited his people from reading the Persian tales of this class, but recommended the heroic traditions of Antar, that 'their hearts might be steeled by them harder than a rock.' The former are pure and mostly extravagant fictions; the adventures of Antar are for the most part historical. Many of the 'Tales' are laid in the time of Harun and Mamun, in which the author of 'Antar' lived, and they speak of those days as of the good old times: but those days form the very period in which Assmai drew the picture of the still more ancient times before Mohammed.

In the Thousand and One Nights we chiefly become acquainted with the inhabitants of cities and the manners of courts; and this could hardly be otherwise in a work, the greater part of which, modelled at a later period on the old Persian form, was, to all appearance,

Digitized by Google

appearance, first written under the government of the old Mameluke Sultans in Egypt, at a time when the era of Harun was considered as the golden age of the khalifate, and his court as the ideal of all oriental courts.[b] In 'Antar,' on the contrary, we see only the Bedouin—the son of nature. We live with him under the tent and in the desert, and accompany him not only to the court of the Arabian viceroy, or governor of Nushirwan, but to the court of the king of kings, Nushirwan himself. Assmai, who lived at the court of Harun and Mamun, was still near enough to the times before Mohammed which he described, to give a more faithful picture of it than the later Egyptian narrators of tales could give of the imperial days of Harun. Or, if we go upon the indisputable truth, that every writer of romance as well as of history, irresistibly influenced and penetrated by the spirit of the age in which he lives, writes far more certainly in the spirit of his own age than that of the ages which have preceded him, 'Antar' must be regarded for the most part as a faithful picture of the golden times of the khalifate in the reigns of Harun and Mamun, when it was written; and the Arabian Nights as mainly a portraiture of the later time of the empire of the Sultans of Egypt, in which (to judge by several indications) the more modern and greater part of the Thousand and One Nights was united with ancient Persian tales. Assmai was besides himself a Bedouin, if not by birth, as is probable, at least in inclination and manners, and in his acquaintance with the customs of the desert, as appears from several passages of his life which history has handed down to us.

Where could we find a more faithful picture of the character and manners of these sons of the desert, who had attained however a certain degree of intellectual refinement? In Antar we meet with a great number of the most striking traits characteristic of the Arabs before Mohammed. We find in it a number of civil and religious institutions, which Mohammed did not introduce, but only confirmed; and others which he changed or abolished. The natural enmity of the frontier inhabitants of Hedjaz and Yemen (the Stony and Happy Arabia); robbery, recognized as a valid title of legal possession; the immense chasm which separates the freeborn from the slave; the titles and pretensions of the nobility; regard for the widows and orphans, and for the priests, who are always taken from among the aged and the wise; the right of the conqueror; the adoration of idols; the pilgrimage to Mecca; the suspension of arms in the sacred months of repose; the honours

[b] This impression as to the state and origin of *The Thousand and One Nights*, first stated by Von Hammer, thirty years ago, has more recently been reproduced, and, we apprehend, satisfactorily proved, by Mr. Lane in his preface to his new translation.

Digitized by Google paid

paid to kings, and the reverence shown to the masterpieces of poetry; the feasts, the games, the tournaments and triumphal processions, the adorning of the idols with wreaths of flowers, the pride of the men in splendid arms, of the women in bracelets, rings, etc.; the solemnities of the three great epochs of human life, the birth, the marriage, and the funeral; the nobility of horses; the attention paid to the harem and to the stud; the delicate purity of female honour; the jealousy shown respecting the unmixed races of the horses, etc.—none of all these particulars is forgotten in this faithful picture. For the historian, the geographer, and the genealogist, it is of particular value, from the names of Arabian tribes, chiefs, mountains, and rivers (the scene being always in the interior of the country), some parts of which are noted in the best map of Arabia which we even yet possess, namely, that of Niebuhr. There we have the names of the tribes and their branches, whose amicable or hostile relations are carried back to the original division of all the Arab tribes into the descendants of Adnan and Joktan. There we have the significant names of the mountains and valleys in Hedjaz and Yemen; and all the charms of the most fruitful valleys of the Happy Arabia vanish, when the hero of the history, and the people of his tribe—the sons of Abs, are seized with a longing after their home in Hedjaz, and after their pleasant mountain, and their well-watered valley. A map noting only approximatingly the names of the mountains, valleys, defiles, and torrents in 'Antar,' would be a chief requisite in publishing this romance in a European dress, if the reader is not to lose the benefit of the important geographical information to be derived from it.

The name of Antar has long been noted in history, and, like that of other heroes, been given to places which are noted in our maps, without being intelligible to the European, who is unacquainted with the history of the 'father of knights.' In Niebuhr's map we find *Chubli 'Antar*, 'the abode of Antar,' and in all the Egyptian maps *Istabli Antar*, 'the stable of Antar.' In the Arabian Irak is also the town of *Nehr Antar*. Antar was in possession of Ebhar, the celebrated race-horse; and was a chief not less famous for his horses than Diomede; and as the memory of the Grecian hero has been preserved in local names, in the island called after him, and in the stable of his horses, the Arabians have likewise preserved the memory of Antar in the names of many places in Arabia, and in Egypt by that of his stables, which tradition states to be the grottoes hewn in the rocks on the banks of the Nile.

The interest which the romance of Antar excites as a poem is equal to that which it presents to the historian or the geographer.

Antar

Digitized by Google

Antar was not only the greatest hero, but the greatest poet, of his time; and the masterpiece of his genius was displayed among the seven poems (Moallakat), written upon parchment with golden ink, and suspended to the Kaaba to receive sacred reverence. The poet who pretended to this honour, hung up his poem himself in the Kaaba, in the presence of all the tribes of Arabia, who had come thither on pilgrimage. By doing this, he not only challenged all the poets of his nation to a poetical contest, but also all those who opposed or envied him (who, without being poets themselves, grudged him this honour) to a trial of arms. Every critic who declared the poet unworthy of this honour, was at liberty to break a lance with him in mortal combat: and the latter was required to be equally ready with his tongue and his arm to maintain the honour which he claimed, against rival poets and warriors, by the superiority both of his eloquence and his valour. Mere censure availed nothing; the critic was required either to excel the poem which he blamed by a better one, or to give decisive weight to his criticism by the point of his spear. Only the poet who was equally master of the sword of the tongue, and the tongue of the sword, remained master of the field of combat and honour in sight of assembled Arabia, and of future generations, so long as the Arabic language should live. Thus Antar, 'the father of knights, and the poet of heroes,' gained the immortal honour—that the tribes of Arabia, revering the supposed divine genius of poetry, prostrated themselves, even in almost adoring reverence, before his poem suspended in the Kaaba.

Besides this masterpiece of Arabian poetry, the romance of 'Antar' contains numerous other fragments of verse, which the hero declaims extempore on various occasions, in the highest fervour of enthusiasm, and some of which, of the highest poetical excellence, are, with justice, no less celebrated than the poem hung in the Kaaba. This latter is contained twice in the work—once in fragments, as the hero delivers them extempore on several occasions in the ardour of the moment, in praise of his mistress, his horse, his sword, his tribe, etc.; and again on occasion of the poetic contest before the assembly of the tribes at Mecca, when the poet united the hitherto scattered pearls of his genius by a golden thread, and suspended them to the Kaaba. This historical circumstance of the origin and completion of one of those seven masterpieces of Arabian poetry, explains at once the hitherto obscure enigma of the want of connection which is observable in each of them. In the Persian 'Ghuzls'—that is, short effusions of the lyrical enthusiasm of the moment, the want of connection between one distich and another can indeed be explained only by the bold flight of eastern imaginations; but in longer poems, like these

Digitized by Google

these Arabian Kassides, the combination of the praise of quite different objects, the sword, the flock, the camel, etc., without any connection into a disjointed whole, merely by putting together the various poems composed on different occasions, is now sufficiently and satisfactorily explained. The question which of the numerous poetical fragments inserted in the romance really belong to Antar, and which to Assmai, and which to the later editors, copyists, and interpolators, cannot now be satisfactorily answered. Certainly only the smallest part belong to the real hero and poet, Antar, many to the later editors, and the rest to the poet Assmai, the original author of the romance. Of such fragments there are in the voluminous work very nearly a thousand, of which perhaps not more than a tenth part might pretend to the approbation of European admirers of eastern poetry, without dread of the reproach of tautology and prolixity. This, too, would probably be nearly the due proportion in making a translation of the most interesting extracts. The sixty octavo, or six folio volumes of an Arabic copy, if compressed into about the latter number of small octavos or duodecimos, might perhaps hope for publishers and readers, which could hardly be expected were the translation made more voluminous.

As might be expected from the age to which it belongs, the language of 'Antar' is uncommonly pure—equally remote from the harshness of earlier and the conceits of later authors. The style of the work as a composition is very plain and easy in construction, but abounding in an endless variety of diction, couched in the most choice and appropriate terms. The sentences are short, and much in the style of the Bible. Even the prose is in rhythm throughout, continuing uninterrupted but by a change of termination, according to the powers of the author, or to the redundancy of expressions with the same sound. Thus with short rhythmical periods of various lengths, the author proceeds for five or six lines to the end of his subject, and then commences other matter with a different rhyme. The poetry put into the mouth of the hero and other personages, has the charm of a more elevated style; and the wider range for the imagination has been eagerly seized by the poet. Infinitely more difficult in its construction, it is still natural, and devoid of those conceits and absurdities that abound in most Asiatic compositions. It comprises every variety to which poetry is applied. The heroic, the complimentary, the laudatory, the amatory, the ludicrous, the jovial, the elegiac, are all combined in the same profusion—even the pastoral, so rare in oriental poetry, is not altogether wanting.

As already intimated, the work has nothing in common with the 'Thousand and One Nights,'—not even magic and enchantment,

Digitized by Google

ment, of which there is but very little—scarcely any, in 'Antar.' Instances of supernatural agency are however to be found; and the belief that ghosts and hobgoblins, or genii, inhabited some particular spot, is seen to have generally prevailed. Sorceresses, potent for evil, sometimes, although rarely, appear; and allusions to genii are of frequent occurrence. They are described as hideous monsters, having their eyes slit upwards, and uttering most terrific sounds. An amulet, bequeathed by a Christian warrior to Antar, is mentioned as famous in the cure of fits. Antar's sword is also no common weapon; and although not enchanted it may be cited by the side of Durindana. Indian blades, Davidean armour, and Aadite casques are invested with the properties of magic weapons, whether for offence or defence. No warrior appears whose skin is impervious to the edge of Antar's sword. There is, however, one hero who is a mass of bone, and no arm but Antar's can strike a blow to crush so miraculous a production. Others are also designated under the formidable appellation of 'earth-rakers,'—so called from their immense stature, so that, when on horseback their feet tore up the ground; and others are denominated 'ear-strippers,' others 'liver-eaters,' etc. The allusions in the poetry to dragons and sea monsters are not infrequent, showing that the introduction of fabulous animals was considered a legitimate ornament of romantic fiction.

It may seem a remarkable circumstance that a work so distinguished, so curious, and belonging to the golden age of Arabian literature, should have been mentioned by no European orientalist down to nearly the commencement of the present century. Even Sir William Jones never saw more than a small portion of 'Antar,' and from that specimen he speaks of the work with high praise in his *Prælectiones.* Even in Asia, the bibliographers seem to have known but little of the work, as the most eminent of them make only cursory mention of it. The most natural way of accounting for this is to suppose, that as the book exclusively related to the Arabs of the desert, unconnected with those men of literature whose habits and pursuits led them to prefer a residence in cities and at courts, it may in course of time have been entirely lost to the learned readers, and only felt and admired among the hordes and tribes, whose manners it so accurately describes, and whose energies and passions it was so well calculated to awaken, in the perusal of the records of the intrepidity of their forefathers. Thus it may have been so long neglected, that it was at last forgotten; still however cherished by those who could but understand its value, and engraved in the hearts and memories of men who could boast of being descended from the heroes and warriors whose exploits it recorded. Even at this present time, Antar as the

Digitized by Google

the hero of this romance, and Assmai as the recorder of his deeds, are but little known beyond the deserts, and the border towns of Aleppo, Damascus, Bagdad, and Cairo. To the Arabs it is their standard work, which excites in them the wildest emotions; read by some, firm in the memory of others, and listened to with avidity by all. This is the work, and not, as is generally supposed, the Thousand and One Nights, which is the source of the stories that fill the tents and cottages in Arabia and Egypt; though materials are often supplied from other works of the same kind.

When copies of the work began to be inquired after, in consequence of the notice of it by Von Hammer, in 1802, it was found exceedingly difficult to procure one in a complete state. In general the copies are bound up in numerous volumes of various sizes—from sixty to twenty, or less. The expense of transcribing so ponderous a work was great; and it was difficult to induce those who got their living by reading the stories in the coffee-houses, to part with their copies. The difficulty of obtaining a perfect copy, with the still greater difficulty of abridging a work of so curious a texture, seemed to forbid the hope that it would ever be rendered accessible by translation. But the possibility of the undertaking was suggested to Mr. Hamilton by his meeting with the work in that compressed shape known as the 'Syrian Antar,' from its having been curtailed of many of its repetitions, and much of its poetry, by some learned inhabitants of Syria. Still, even in this compressed shape, the work was sufficiently bulky. The translator was appalled at the idea of presenting it whole to the public. He therefore divided it into three parts, the first of which, extending to the marriage of Antar, he published separately; and this, although but a third of the abridged Antar, extends to four densely printed duodecimo volumes, containing fully as much matter as so many octavos. This was presented to the public thirty years ago; and as the remainder has not appeared, it is to be feared that the translator found but little encouragement to persevere in his undertaking. This is perhaps not greatly to be regretted. The vast extent of the work—even in the reduced scale of this translation, would appal even the intrepid appetite which could digest the Cassandra and Grand Cyrus of a former age, or the Richardsonian tales in the last. It could engage the attention only of the few who might seek to glean from it the facts illustrative of old Arabian ideas and usages, without the means of consulting the original, which is so difficult of access even to those who know the language in which it is written. An abstract of the whole work, in about the space this portion of it occupies, would probably be acceptable as a tale to the

Digitized by Google

the general reader; but could not be of much value to the student, who would find most interest in the very details which such an abstract must necessarily omit. Even the translation of the Syrian Antar—large as it is—would scarcely meet his wants; for it appears, from the large specimen which the translator has furnished, that many very essential facts and descriptions of the original have not been preserved.

Although somewhat diffuse, the translation is generally correct. The style however (as the reader may judge from the specimens we shall furnish) is not exactly that which we should like to see in translations of Arabian works. It wants that oriental *colour* which Mr. Lane has so admirably preserved in his excellent translation of the Thousand and One Nights, and which would have appeared to still greater advantage in the translation of a work of still more ancient date. The *modern* English character of the style is at times so offensive, that in some of our quotations we have ventured to improve it here and there, by giving to words and sentences a more antique and oriental cast, without in any way disturbing, but rather, as we hope, improving the sense.

In proceeding to the task we have undertaken, we shall be able generally to point out Scripture parallels sufficiently exact, and often most strikingly analogous. But the reader who looks to this only, will inadequately realize the satisfaction to be derived from this kind of illustration. It will often occur, that when the bare fact suggests no direct analogy to any circumstance or usage mentioned in Scripture, the turn of the ideas and of the language is so entirely in the style of the Bible, that an adequate and remarkable analogy is present to the mind, even in the absence of precisely parallel facts.

In what is essentially a romance of chivalry, the usages of war are necessarily the most abundantly illustrated. The analogies to Scriptural usages are very great, although a considerable difference is at the first view produced by the constant use of horses in Arabian warfare, contrasted with the general absence of these animals in the military actions recorded in Scripture. It is at this day the common practice among the Arabians for actions between the tribes to commence by single combats, in which the defeat of one of the combatants draws on a general action. In 'Antar' this procedure constantly occurs; and it is worthy of remark, that although it is often stipulated that the triumph of one of the combatants shall decide the controversy in favour of the side to which he belongs—this condition is but rarely adhered to; but the opposing parties, inspired the one by revenge, and the other by triumph, rush upon each other the moment one of the champions

Digitized by Google

champions falls. The reader will recollect Scriptural instances of this practice in the case of David and Goliah, and in that between the men of Abner and Joab at the pool of Gibeon. 2 Sam. ii. 15.

Near the very beginning of Antar we have a curious example of this. King Jazeemah, of the tribe of Abs, has become very powerful, and has received the submission of most of the neighbouring tribes, who render him tribute in cattle and in camels. But there was a tribe of Reeyan, governed by a warlike queen, called Robab, who resolved never to submit to this. 'We,' said they, 'will not give any one even a rope's end; and whoever demand goods of us, nothing will we give them but blows and trouble.' Hearing this, King Jazeemah marches against them—'that he might send down destruction and torment upon them, and leave their property to be pillaged by the Arabs.' When the tribe of Reeyan saw his armies advancing, they were far from dismayed. 'They set up a loud shout, and they thronged in haste from all quarters, and the mountains trembled at the uproar.' This shouting of advancing armies, adverse we believe to the habits of modern European warfare, is often mentioned in Scripture and described in nearly the same terms. The queen sends a herald to inquire the object of this incursion. The ambassador on being introduced to the king kisses the ground before him—an abject custom of which the Scripture is not without some notice (Ruth ii. 10; 1 Sam. xx. 41; 2 Sam. xiv. 4). The king uses large language towards this person, strongly analogous to the military hyperboles of Scripture. 'I shall command these armies, numerous as the locusts, to assault you, and to grind you like grain, and to ride you like lions.' Compare this with 2 Kings xiii. 7; Judges vi. 5; vii. 12; Psalm lxvi. 12. On hearing this, the queen proposes that to spare the effusion of blood, the matter shall be decided by single combat between her and him. In Goliah's challenge the terms are, the servitude of the vanquished. 'If ye be able to fight with me, and to kill me, then will we be your servants; but if I prevail against him, then shall ye be our servants and serve us.' Queen Robab's terms are more liberal: 'If he subdues me, I will submit to him, and pay him tribute; but if I vanquish him, I will grant his life and take his ransom.'

This challenge could not be refused: the description of the fight is exceedingly graphic and animated, and gives a good idea of this kind of action:—

'The king agreed and consented; and immediately he came down to the field, and he was like a furious lion. He galloped and charged before the warriors, and rushed in to the scene of blows and thrusts.

Queen

Digitized by Google

Queen Robab dashed down upon him, mounted on a raven-coloured steed, strong sinewed. She charged with him over the plain, till the horsemen were amazed. Then they began the storm and bluster, the sport and exertion, the give and the take, the struggle and the wrestle; and every eye gazed intently on them, and every neck was stretched out at them. Just then passed between them two matchless spear thrusts. King Jazeemah's was the first, so roused was he by the terrors and calamities that threatened him. But when Robab beheld the spear thrust coming upon her, and that death was in it, she bent herself forward till her breast touched the horse, and the well-aimed thrust passed without effect. She then replaced herself on the saddle, and dashed furiously at him, and attacked him. She struck him with horror, and drove the spear through his chest, and forced out the point sparkling at his back. He tottered from his horse, and his senses were annihilated.'

Instead of this concluding the combat, according to terms, it only, as usual, began it,—

'Then the Arabs assailed each other, and the earth shook beneath them. Blows fell right and wrong; necks were hewn off, and hoary heads were stained with blood. The struggle was intense; and all the Arabs in those valleys were in universal commotion.'

The tribe of Abs was, as it deserved to be, beaten; and the rout is exactly like one of those described in Scripture, and the description is in almost Scriptural language,—

'Soon fled the tribe of Abs and Adnan and all their allies, and sought their homes in fear of death and destruction; neither did they halt in their flight and rout till they reached their own camp; and when they learned the extent of their misfortune, and how many kings and chiefs had been slain, the lamentations were general. *They threw down their tents and pavilions; and thus they continued seven days and nights.*'—See Jer. iv. 20; Job ii. 13.

Afterwards the war was renewed, with very different results; and in the great action that followed, 'Many drank the bitter poison of death,' a perfectly scriptural phrase, of which there are many examples in 'Antar.' The consequences of victory are also such as we often find in Scripture.

'The Reeyanians were routed, and fled towards their habitations; the Absians pursued them, and spread desolation among them; slew them with their swords, and dispersed them among their wilds and deserts, until they reached their country, where they took possession of their tents and plundered their property. Zoheir [son of the slain king] returned home, and rejoiced in the accomplishment of his vengeance. He divided the wealth and lands of all that belonged to his enemies among his own people, and all the spoil was given to the rich and poor, to his slaves and chiefs. Many of the hostile leaders were put to death; and all the Arabs far and near were terrified at the extent of his dominion and the power of his arm.'

Here

Digitized by Google

Here we see that King Zoheir, satisfied with vengeance for his father's blood, takes no share in the spoil. Gratified revenge is spoil enough for him. We observe also that, as was the case among the Hebrews, the poor and even the slaves were admitted to a share in the spoil. Those therefore who remained behind in charge of the camp, were not excluded from the advantage—in perfect accordance with the Mosaical regulation on the subject—afterwards enforced by David when he also had routed an Arabian tribe which had plundered his town of Ziklag in his absence. See 1 Sam. xxx. 24.

We also notice here, that down to a period sixteen centuries later than any instance of the kind occurring in Scripture, the war usages of the Arabians still permitted a practice for which the Hebrew leaders have been bitterly reproached—the execution of captive chiefs in cold, or comparatively cool, blood. Other instances of the same fact might be produced from among other nations, showing that in war (which always brings out the worst qualities of man) the Israelites were no worse at least than their neighbours, and that they, in fact, reformed the barbarous practice much sooner than any of their neighbours did.

We all know that to uphold the doctrine of the unity of God, and to prevent the danger of the Israelites multiplying gods unto themselves, they were allowed but one temple and one altar—the place of the only authorized ritual worship in the land. To erect other altars and temples would have been a dreadful enormity, even though it might be in the first instance designed for the service of God. Hence the ahhorrence and horror with which the Israelites regarded the erection of a separate altar, Josh. xxii., and the ill consequences which are described as flowing from the chapelries of Gideon, of Micah, and of the Danites at Dan (Judg. xviii. 30, 31), and the still stronger reprobation of the establishments set up in Israel after the separation of the kingdoms, 1 Kings v. 19, as well as the disfavour with which the orthodox Jews regarded the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim, and even that erected at Onion (Heliopolis) in Egypt, for the use of the Egyptian Jews. We should hardly expect to find anything analogous to this in an Arabian romance. But here, nevertheless, we do discover one of the most remarkable illustrations that has ever fallen under our notice.

It is to be observed that the Arabians were idolaters. Images, under various forms and names—the sun, the moon, or some of the constellations, were the objects of their worship, although it may be admitted that some tribes looked up to a Supreme Being, and only regarded the planets or idols as mediators with the Divinity at the final resurrection. Some did not believe in a future state; and

Digitized by Google

and those who had some vague notions on the subject imagined that the dead upon whose tombs a camel was slaughtered, would rise from the dead mounted on its back, whereas those for whom this ceremony should not be performed, would be called to judgment on foot. Mecca and its Kaaba, or temple, which is now the central point of the Mohammedan religion, was also then the centre of ceremonial observance. Mecca was venerated on account of Abraham and Ishmael, who were believed to have dwelt there; and the Kaaba is and was believed to have been erected by them; and as such, it was an object of holy pilgrimage, attended with most of the same ceremonies that are practised at the present day. After this explanation we may turn again to our romance.

"At this period the Kaaba and the holy Mecca were visited as at this day. Numerous were the pilgrims at the shrine of Abraham. Sacred were the months of pilgrimage; and had a man even killed his father at that period, his crime was never mentioned. Zoheir, after he had accomplished these glorious deeds, wished to make a pilgrimage, which he executed, attended by all the chiefs of his tribe. His admiration was great in performing the ceremony of walking round the Kaaba, and in kissing the sacred stone. On his return home he was anxious to erect a building similar to the sacred altar, whither pilgrims should resort, where travellers should be entertained, and the hungry fed, and the fearful be in security; in whose precincts no beast of prey should be chased; no blood should be shed; and a transgressor of my law shall be instantly put to death with this sword, he exclaimed. These sentiments he expressed to his tribe assembled in council. All were in dismay at his resolution; but no one dared disapprove or make any answer. But an old sheikh who had passed all his days in perusing ancient chronicles, and was well acquainted with all the sayings of wise men, who acknowledged the unity of God, the maker of the heavens and the earth, ventured forth, and he expostulated with Zoheir, telling him the Kaaba was the mansion of the blessed Abraham, and were he to presume to imitate it, a cruel death would avenge the insult.'

The old sheikh then proceeds to express his sentiments in rhythmical verse, as is the wont of every one who has anything particular to say in 'Antar,' and as indeed was, and still to a great extent is, the custom of the Arabians.

'O great king! O son of noble chiefs! hold, and listen to my words, and renounce the habits of the ignobly born. Mount not the horse of Outrage, for it will not deliver thee from the messengers of Death; and soon mayest thou expect him, shouldst thou dare to erect in the desert a mansion like the sacred shrine of the Kaaba; shouldst thou establish similar rites and ceremonies to Menah and Zengein [c] and the temple. Away, away! their land is the land of a tribe superior to all mankind. . . . . Away with what thou hast said, for thy God is swift of vengeance.'

[c] Places near Mecca.

The

Digitized by Google

The king yielded to these reasons, supported as they were by his chiefs, and very reluctantly abandoned his design. Soon after he turns his attention to marriage, and as the affair seems to afford some points of illustrative interest, we must tarry over it for a few pages, although anxious to come to the hero, the redoubted Antar himself. He became desirous of contracting marriage with some lady 'eminent for beauty and elegance of form, and of a noble family.' He caused inquiries to be made far and near for such a treasure, and at length heard that it existed in the person of Temadhur, 'whose equal was not to be found neither in the plains nor in the cities.' When the king heard of her, and of the obstacles to the attainment of her hand through her father Amru's aversion to her marriage, 'he longed for her as a thirsty man wishes to have water:' and by a sharp contrivance he not only obtains her, but receives her as a free gift, without the dowry which he might have been expected to pay. After winning the good opinion of the father by presents and attentions, he causes an attack to be made on his camp, that he may come forward at the proper moment as a deliverer and obtain the sight of Temadhur, whom he had not yet been suffered to behold. All answers as he expected—the attack is made, and all things are in confusion when Zoheir appears. 'The family were looking at their flocks, dispersed about, but Temadhur was standing at the door of the tent, blooming as the dawning sun, and her forehead bright as its rays, and her cheeks were red as the peony, and her hair dishevelled, black as night.' Impressed by this deliverance, Amru, at the feast of wine that followed, in the excess of his gratitude rose up and said: 'O mighty and magnanimous king, I am your slave! My tongue fails in describing your virtues. God hath given me nothing that I prize but my daughter Temadhur, from whom I have kept all suitors. I request of ye, assembled chiefs, that he may accept of her as his handmaiden.' The story then goes on.

'As soon as Zoheir heard this he rejoiced and was glad; and the Absians[d] answered, "And we, too, will beg king Zoheir to accept her, *and to cause the daughters of noble chiefs to wait upon her.*"[e] As soon as Zoheir heard these words he leaped up, and taking the old man by the hand most earnestly entreated him to consent. He richly clothed him, and made him handsome presents, and then said, "She shall be, O chief, equal to the most exalted in rank and highest in dignity." The marriage canopy was instantly pitched, and there was no further demur. The damsels advanced conducting the concealed treasure. Her approach was at that moment sweeter to him than sleep to the wearied eyelids, and he beheld in her the stem of a tall reed

[d] Men of his own tribe of Abs.

[e] See Psalm xlv. 9.

Digitized by Google

reed and the rose of the soul. They were immediately united. On the second day Zoheir arose and thanked his fortune, for his anxieties were past. He made presents, and distributed the gold and silver, and he made Amru's people remain with him, *that he might treat them for seven days, when he made the marriage feast*, slaughtering the camels and the sheep.'

The wedding feasts of Jacob and of Samson were of the same duration. The king's surprise and delight made him so vain and conceited that at last he imparted to his wife the stratagem by which he had obtained her without a dower or a settlement. Now, while she felt that she had been given to the king in consideration of a great service—that service had seemed as the price—and that no mean price, which had been given for her; and her pride was satisfied. But to learn that this seeming service had been no more than a wile, and that in consequence she had as it were been absolutely given away without consideration or value, filled her with the most intense indignation, and set her woman's wit to work, to find out the means of repairing this wrong. She told the king scornfully that in this instance the biter had been bit, for that she was not herself the renowned Temadhur, but her sister. 'She is more beautiful than the sun and moon. I am not worthy to be her handmaid. I do not possess a particle of her charms. On the face of the earth there is not her equal, among the daughters of Arabia there is not her like.'

On this the king's happiness fled: but he required ocular demonstration of the fact—how to obtain it was the question. It appears indeed throughout the story that the unmarried daughters of the chiefs were much more secluded than we should have supposed, and that to obtain the sight of them was difficult. The evidence which might be got through an old woman did not content him. 'No human being,' said he, 'can behold your sister but a merchant (pedler), a blacksmith, a fortune-teller, or a perfumer.' 'You are right,' she replied, 'for the daughters of Arabia value the goods of a merchant, a blacksmith, a fortune-teller, and a perfumer.' 'There,' said the king, 'there is no intelligence like the eyes, and no sight like the hearing of the ears. I am myself an Arab and must undertake the business myself.' He determines to visit the place as a perfumer; and the next day he laid his royal robes aside, habited himself as a poor man, and, taking some drugs and perfumes, departed from his tent, 'his loins girt about and his feet naked.' He walked slowly at first, but when at a sufficient distance quickened his pace. But quick as he was, Temadhur was before him. She hastened to her father's tent in man's clothes and apprised her friends of what had taken place, and instructed them how to act. Accordingly

Digitized by Google

Accordingly when the pretended perfumer arrived, her father and brothers 'rushed upon him like lions,' and seized him hand and foot. His wife then stood before him, and throwing off her veil said, 'O king, what think you of your condition and your artifices? Which of us is the most cunning now?' Nevertheless, the sight of his wife revived him; but he knew that the business was too serious to be trifled with, and therefore he allowed an adequate dower to be extorted from him before he was unbound. He at first offered five hundred camels; he then consented to add five hundred high-priced camels, and was at last let off for 'a thousand he and she camels, twenty horses, fifty male slaves, and fifty female.' It is but fair to king Zoheir, who is somewhat of a personage in 'Antar,' to add, that the evasion of the dower in the first instance had not been from avarice, but had grown out of the plot through which he alone hoped to obtain the lady from her father; and also that, greatly to his credit, he took this rough manœuvre in very good part—indeed that 'his love for his wife greatly increased by reason of her conduct, and he gave her large possessions.'

The discontent of Temadhur at having been disposed of without dowry may remind us of the dissatisfaction expressed by Laban's daughters at their father having made such arrangements with their husband as excluded them from the usual benefits of dowry: 'He hath sold us, and also quite devoured our money,' Gen. xxxi. 15. And the importance attached to the matter, with the very large dowry or price exacted in the present instance, shows the boundless liberality of Shechem, who, in proposing to Jacob to repair by marriage the wrong he had inflicted upon Dinah, says, 'Ask me never so much dowry and gift, and I will give it, according to what ye shall say unto me; but give me the damsel to wife,' Gen. xxxiv. 12.

This marriage of king Zoheir produced, in the course of time, ten sons and one daughter. The mention of this fact brings to notice a remarkable and interesting custom. 'Now it was a custom among the Arabs that when a woman brought forth ten male children she should be called Moonejeba, *i. e.*, ennobled, and for her name be published among the Arabs; and they used to say that the wife of such a one is ennobled.' Considering that the desire for male offspring was as strong among the Hebrews as among the Arabs, it is highly probable that with them also some distinction was attached to the possession of a certain number of sons; but we can call to mind no text that can be regarded as bearing on the point, unless it be Elkanah's kind words to his wife Hannah, mourning in her barrenness, 'Am I not better to thee than ten sons?' 1 Sam. i. 8.

Digitized by Google

The tribe over which Zoheir reigned became very prosperous, and now and then the chiefs went forth on plundering expeditions, and returned laden with spoil. One of these expeditions, composed of ten horsemen, going forth in search of adventures, fell in with a peaceful tribe, that, like the people of Laish, 'dwelt quiet and secure, and had no lack of anything' (Judg. xviii. 7). 'It was a tribe under no apprehension of change of fortune.' Our heroes being so few in number feared to attack the tribe in its head-quarters, but were content to drive off the camels, together with a black woman slave and the two lads her sons, by whom they were kept. This woman's name is Zebeeba. 'She was of extraordinary beauty and well shaped, and her appearance was elegant and striking.' One of the warriors, named Shedad, is content to have this woman for his share of the spoil, and in due time he has by her a son. 'She brought forth a boy, black and swarthy like an elephant, flat-nosed, blear-eyed, harsh-featured, shaggy-haired; the corners of his lips hanging down, and the inner angles of his eyes bloated; strong-boned, long-footed; he was *like a fragment of a cloud*, his ears immensely long, and his eyes whence flashed sparks of fire.' The personage thus impressively introduced, and of whom this amiable portraiture is given, is no other than the hero, the redoubtable Antar.

The early history of Antar is very interesting to us for the illustration it gives of the condition of a female slave who has given a son to her master, and of the position occupied by the son himself—points valuable for the illustration of similar conditions among the Hebrews, with respect to which we have little direct information. The case of Hagar and Ishmael immediately rises to our recollection, and it is well if the facts to which we have here access, tend to throw some light upon a subject involved in much obscurity and beset with many difficulties.

We find, then, in the first place that the mother and son remain slaves until the father thinks fit, if he ever thinks fit, to acknowledge the latter formally as his son, in the presence of the tribe, which is already well aware of the *fact*, but does not recognize it until the father acknowledges his son; and this, in Antar's case, was not until he grew to manhood.

Some change is made, however, in the woman's condition, although she still has charge of the camels. Soon after the weaning of Antar she is allowed a separate dwelling for herself and children, and nothing that she wants is withheld from her.

As Antar grew up he used to accompany his mother to the pastures, and watched the cattle. His immense bodily strength soon enabled him to establish a complete tyranny over the boys of his own age, and even the camels were speedily taught to know in

Digitized by Google

in him their master. 'He used to tyrannise over boys of the same age, and beat his brothers; and when he returned from the pastures he amused himself with the servants and the women. He would eat nothing but what he liked, and whoever offended him he would thrash with a stick.'

Let us see more of his mode of life—which may in some respects remind us of David. The resemblance would be greater but for the ugliness of Antar, his ignoble origin, and the tyrannous temper he evinces. Like David, Antar tends his father's flock; like David, Antar in youth evinces his prowess against the animals that assail his flock; like David, Antar is the first warrior of his time; and like him he wins the unbounded admiration of his contemporaries, as the first and chief of all in song. The analogy of these two persons being in their respective ages the most distinguished *both* in arms and minstrelsy, is very remarkable. The following adventure may remind us of David's conflict with the lion and the bear, but, to our taste, the exploit of David is better and more beautifully told:—'Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock; and I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered it out of his mouth: and when he arose against me, I caught him by his beard, and smote him and slew him,' 1 Sam. xvii. 34, 35. Antar's adventure was with a wolf:—

'One day he was wandering over the deserts with the flocks, and when the sun was burning hot, he left his people and climbed up into a tree, and took shelter from the heat, while the flocks grazed, and he watched them: when, lo! a wolf started from behind the trees and dispersed them. But Antar, seeing how the animal had dispersed his herds, descended and ran after him until he overtook him, and struck him with his staff between the eyes. He made the oil of his brains fly out from between his ears, and slew him. He then cut off his head and his legs, and returned growling like an angry lion. "And so thou wouldst devour Antar's flocks?" cried he, addressing himself to the dead wolf; "but thou dost not know that he is a savage lion." He put the head and the legs into the scrip he had with him; leaving the carcase, he returned to the flocks, and thus spoke:—"O thou wolf, eager for death, I have left thee wallowing in dust and spoiled of life. Thou wouldst have the run of my flocks, but I have left thee dyed with blood. Thou wouldst disperse my sheep, and now thou knowest I am a lion that never fears. This is the way that I treat thee, thou dog of the desert."'

And here, lest our naturalist friends should infer from this that the Arabs regard the wolf as a wild dog—and hence that they allow the lupine origin of the dog, it is proper to observe that the term 'dog' is among the Arabs as with us, a term of abuse and insult, applied not only to men but to animals; and it is

Digitized by Google

is amusing to hear them abuse horses, asses, camels, and other animals by calling them 'dogs.'

This exploit of Antar's is not equal to that of David, as a lion or a bear are more formidable antagonists than a wolf; but Antar was but 'a big boy' when it was performed; and this fact is impressed upon our recollection by the alarm expressed by his mother when she found the head and legs of the wolf in his scrip on his return home in the evening.

In a tale founded upon the usages of the desert, we may expect to find some of those contentions about water, which so frequently occur in the Scripture history of the patriarchs. The disposition of the powerful to tyrannise over the weak in the appropriation of water, is strikingly shown in Antar's next adventure, which may remind us of the value of that aid which Moses rendered to Jethro's daughters, when the shepherds drove them away on their coming to the well to water their father's flocks.

King Zoheir had two hundred slaves who attended his he and she camels, and all his sons had the same. The eldest of his sons, Shas, had a slave named Daji, who was much liked by his master on account of his vast bodily strength. But his temper was tyrannical and imperious, and he was hated and feared by all the other slaves of the camp, except by Antar, to whom fear was unknown.

'One day the poor men, the widows, and the orphans met together, and were driving their camels and their flocks to drink, and were all standing by the water side. Daji came up and stopped them all, and took possession of the water for his master's cattle. Just then an old woman belonging to the tribe of Abs came up to him, and accosted him in a suppliant manner, saying, "Be so good, master Daji, as to let my cattle drink. They are all the property I possess, and I live by their milk. Pity my flock; have compassion upon me, grant my request, and let them drink." But he paid no attention to her demand, but abused her. She was greatly distressed, and shrank back. There came another old woman and addressed him: "O master Daji, I am a poor, weak, old woman, as you see. Time has dealt hardly with me; it has aimed its arrows at me, and its daily and nightly calamities have destroyed all my men. I have lost my children and my husband, and since then I have been in great distress. These sheep are all that I possess; let them drink, for I live on the milk they produce. Pity my forlorn estate: I have no one to tend them, therefore grant my request, and be so kind as to let them drink."

'As soon as Daji heard these words, and perceived the crowd of men and women, his pride increased, and his obstinacy was not to be moved. He struck the woman on the stomach and threw her down on her back.'

All the slaves laugh at this, and at the disorder of the poor woman's

Digitized by Google

woman's dress—all but Antar, who remonstrated in so high a tone against this conduct that Daji struck him 'a blow over the face that nearly knocked out his eyes.' He returns this by rushing at him, lifting him on high, and dashing him to the ground, so that 'his length and breadth were all one mass.' Seeing their fellow slain, the other slaves fell upon Antar, and it would have gone hard with him, had not prince Malik, the youngest son of king Zoheir, passed by, and seeing one man contending against such odds, interfered to stop the fray. On hearing the facts of the case, he expressed his admiration and approval of Antar's conduct, and gave him that formal *dakheel* or protection which was then, as it is still among the Arabs, a most solemn obligation —obliging the one who affords it, by the highest pledge of honour known in the East, to shield the other from harm even to the peril of his own life. It was such a pledge as another king's son, Jonathan, extended to David; and how well he redeemed it, even to the risk of his life and in the face of his father's displeasure, we all know. See 1 Sam. xvii. xviii. xix. 'Walk by my side,' said Malik; 'I will protect you against every one that exists under the heavens, against all who eat bread and drink water.' On this, 'Antar bowed down before him, and kissed his feet in his stirrup, and walked on with the slaves.'

Malik had undertaken no easy task. His elder brother was highly incensed when he heard how his favourite slave had been handled, and sought to slay Antar with his own hand. But Malik interfered: 'You must not touch him,' he said. 'He who dares to injure him is a dead man. I have given him my protection. I will not be separated from him—sooner will I forfeit my head.' Shas heeded not this, and attempted to smite Antar; when Malik drew his sword, and the brothers were on the point of coming to blows, when the king appeared, and put an end to the dispute. On learning what Antar had done, the king commended him; and turning to his father Shedad, who was present, he said, 'Your son's conduct reflects credit on you. His behaviour will remain as a memorial to all generations. He hath loathed oppression and violence, and hath followed the path of propriety and virtue.'

Antar's father was nevertheless becoming highly dissatisfied with his son's conduct. While he did not recognize him as a son, he was in some degree responsible for his conduct as a slave, and was bound as such to make good to others the damage he inflicted. Besides, for an Arab, he liked a quiet life, and was annoyed at being compromised with this and that powerful person through Antar's exploits. A communication which he received a short time after from Zajir, a slave of Rebia, one of the sheikhs of

Digitized by Google

of the tribe, roused his displeasure to the utmost: 'O master,' said Zajir, 'your slave Antar does nothing but injure your property. He ranges about the country, and all day long he keeps the cattle away from the water and from the pastures, riding and driving them about, and reducing their flesh by incessant exercise, and injuring the trees by spearing them. I order him not to do so, but he abuses me and beats me; and were I to go near him he would slay me.' This made Shedad exceedingly angry: 'You tell me the truth, my lad,' he said; 'for from the time I have directed him to tend my herds they do not get fat, but have ulcers in their feet; and this is a proof that he rides them and drives them about the rocky places, and thus they lose their flesh.'

When Shedad's wife heard this, she thought it a fit opportunity to make known a recent grievance of her own against Antar. It was the custom among the Arab women at that period to drink camel's milk morning and evening. As they had a very sensible dislike, which we cannot but share, to drinking milk with the animal heat still in it, it was the office of the servant who milked it, to cool the beverage in the wind before presenting it to the ladies. It was Antar's office to do this for the wife of his father, and for the wives of his father's two brothers, Zakmet-ul-Jewad and Malik, and for Abla, the daughter of the latter. For this Abla he had already contracted a deep affection, and obeying its impulses, he one day, almost unconsciously, presented the milk first to her and afterwards to Shedad's wife, whom he ought to have served first of all. This affront that high lady deeply resented, and it formed the offence of which she now complains to Shedad, and which added materially to the anger that already burned fiercely against his son. He waited, however, patiently till Antar came home from the pasture; he then seized fast hold of him, tied him up, and beat him with a stick till the skin peeled off from his body. To this Antar submitted patiently, although with his tremendous strength he could easily have resisted or escaped from this punishment. But on this and all other occasions he is perfectly submissive and obedient to his father, and in his hands, and in his alone, is non-resistant against injury and torture. Nothing can more clearly evince the absolute nature of paternal power in such a patriarchal state of society, than these examples which the history of Antar offers. It is the voluntary submission of one who knows his power, to the commanding influence of an opinion—to an authority which, although physically weak, is, as towards him, morally absolute, and is indeed irresistible even unto death. Some have affected to doubt the history of Abraham's attempted sacrifice of Isaac, on the ground that Isaac was then a young man, not likely

Digitized by Google

likely to suffer himself to be bound and laid upon the altar for such a purpose, seeing that he might easily have prevented this proceeding on the part of an aged man, less strong probably than himself. He might have fled, if he had shrunk from the act of personal resistance to his father. We have an opinion that Abraham made known to Isaac the command he had received, and that the son concurred in the act of his own immolation. But if not, we are convinced that the son would have yielded as an act of obedience to paternal authority, which was in his view absolute —for life or for death. So here Antar, though another Samson for strength, consents to be bound, and submits without complaint to a cruel punishment—for no other reason than because it was from his father's hand. How voluntary this submission was on his part is shown by the fact, that when, after his father was gone, he learned from his mother why, and at whose complaint, he had been thus made to suffer, he, like another Samson, struggled with the cords that bound him, and bursting them, started forward like a lion to be avenged on Zajir. He found him in the pastures; 'Thou base-born!' he cried, 'thou son of a foul mother! thou didst instigate my master to beat me.' He said no more, but forthwith rushed upon him and slew him, by his choice method, when unarmed, of lifting him on high, and smashing his bones by dashing him to the ground,—a mode of high and powerful extinction often alluded to in Scripture—being, in fact, that 'dashing in pieces, like a potter's vessel,' of which we read in Psalm ii. 9.

The reader will not fail to remark the peculiar force of the epithets applied to Zajir from Antar, who was himself a bastard son. In fact, among the Arabs as among the Hebrews, nothing can be more insulting than terms of abuse applied to the mother; and they are used for the purpose of wounding the person insulted, in utter indifference to every other consideration. Thus Saul assails Jonathan as 'Thou son of the perverse, rebellious woman,' etc., though Jonathan's mother was his own wife: and Antar himself often in the sequel, applies the terms of 'base-born' and 'son of a foul mother' to his own brother.

Having satisfied his vengeance, Antar began to be alarmed for the consequences; he went to Prince Malik and informed him of what had passed. Malik saw that our hero had now exposed himself to the resentment of Rebia, the master of the slave he had slain. Understanding, therefore, that this person had gone by invitation to an assembly of the sheikhs, at the king his father's tent, he followed him thither. All the chiefs and their followers, except the reigning family, rose when he entered; and politeness required that he should take his place as soon as possible, that the others might then sit down. But he remained standing; and when reminded

Digitized by Google

minded of this by Rebia himself, he said, 'Dost thou wish that I should sit down? and dost thou love me?' 'Yes,' said Rebia, 'by the lives of all who are present.' Of this expected declaration Malik promptly took advantage. 'Then,' said he, 'I will not sit down till thou hast given me thy slave Zajir.' Rebia was far from suspecting what had happened to his slave. He ought to have consented without question, and as gracefully as he might; but his surprise at Malik's knowledge of this slave, made him ask, 'What makes thee so anxious to have him?' Malik answered, 'Because I have observed him to be a good hard-working slave, and very laborious in doing his duty.' 'Sit down then,' said Rebia, 'I will give him to thee, and, if such be thy wish, two more with him.' To make all firm beyond repentance, when the truth should be known, Malik makes the assembled chiefs legal witnesses of this transaction—'Let these assembled chiefs be witnesses of what thou sayest.' 'Yes,' said Rebia, 'let the God who raised the vaulted heavens, and levelled the expanded earth, be witness of my grant to thee, and that I will never remind thee of the favour rendered.' 'Be witness to it all ye that are present!' said Malik, who then ventured to disclose the truth—'Know then, O Rebia, that Antar has killed thy slave and has sought my protection: do not therefore seek his life.' Rebia was silent—but the wrath in his heart was great, and from that moment he cherished in his heart a most bitter hatred against Antar.

This transaction requires more than the incidental remark that we have given to it.

There are other examples in Antar of the expedient here employed, of asking the gift of a slave who had been killed that the master may have no demand against the life of the slayer or his master—seeing that he has with the person of his slave transferred the right of exacting vengeance for his blood. Even where the master knows that his slave is slain, he may sell him in quittance of all claim against the slayer—but the person who desires to protect the slayer, usually tries to conceal the fact of the death, that the demands of the owner may not be enhanced, or his reluctance increased by a knowledge of the urgency of the occasion. In the case of the slaying of the slave of Prince Shas by Antar, King Zoheir bought the dead slave of his son for ten live slaves, which was therefore in part the quittance price of his vengeance against Antar. In point of fact Shedad himself should on that occasion have ransomed Antar, unless Shas had insisted on life for life. This would have been sufficient in the case like this, of a slave slaying a slave. But in the case of a slave slaying a free man, his life would not have been regarded as a sufficient equivalent; and the master must then either pay the full compensation money—'the price

Digitized by Google

price of blood'—or remain subject in his own person, or that of some free member of his family, to the fatal exaction of the blood-avenger. But King Zoheir behaved generously by all parties in this matter—and at the same time excluded Shas from vengeance, while he relieved Shedad from the trouble of considering whether he should redeem his slave-son, or abandon him to the avenger.

We do not call to mind any scriptural instance or positive law bearing on the case of one man's slave slaying the slave of another. But we apprehend that, from the general spirit of the Mosaical legislation on this subject, and from the analogy of customs, that the master of the slaying slave was obliged to make compensation to the master of the slave who was slain, unless, as in this case, some one interested succeeded in obtaining by gift or purchase the transfer of the rights which the master of the slain slave had in him, including the right of compensation and revenge. Our knowledge of the Mosaical legislation on this point is imperfect, and this case may therefore be taken to throw some light upon it. But it may be observed that the law of Moses evidently aimed at the melioration of the condition of slavery, and deprived the master of some rights which he had previously possessed. The Bedouin practice probably more perfectly illustrates the condition of the slave in the time of the patriarchs. Under the law the master did not possess the power of life and death over his slave (Exod. xxi. 20, 21), and that power which he did not himself possess, another could not exercise. But it may be doubtful whether, if the master of a slain slave put to death the slave of another who had slain him, the law would have taken cognizance of the case, or have considered the master of the latter entitled to any compensation. The case had then been equalized, according to eastern notions. These considerations would naturally bring into operation such proceedings as we witness in the affair before us.

To the striking incident of the prince refusing to sit down till he learned whether Rebia would grant his wish, there is no *precise* parallel in Scripture, but the principle is discovered in the declaration of Abraham's servant when he arrived at the house of Laban, and food was set before him. 'I will not eat until I have told mine errand,' Gen. xxiv. 33—it being quite usual in some parts of the East for a person on going to the house where he has a suit to prefer, to decline to eat until he has made known his wish, and has learned that it will not be refused. To suffer a stranger to depart without food, would be as disgraceful in the East as to suffer a prince to remain standing; and the condition therefore lays the person to whom application is made under the same kind of obligation to grant the suit which is made.

Again,

Digitized by Google

Again, we observe in this instance the solicitude to obtain living witnesses to transactions — necessary in the absence of contracts and undertakings by written documents. We see this constantly in Scripture. Thus, in the instance of Abraham's purchase of a sepulchre, it is carefully stated that the transaction took place 'in the presence of the children of Heth, before all that went in at the gate:' and Boaz, in the purchase of a reversion, at the gate of Bethlehem, says unto the elders and all the people, 'Ye are witnesses this day that I have bought,' &c. And they answer, 'We are witnesses,' Ruth iv. 10-12.

We next come to Antar's combat with a lion. It is described with great force and spirit; and it is so far of scriptural interest, inasmuch as it may be regarded as *filling out* the picture of the similar exploits by Samson and by David. Both these great adventures were like Antar's, achieved by weaponless men, and in the same manner, by *rending* the savage beast. But David smote the lion in defence of his flocks—Samson slew the lion that roared against him; whereas Antar sought the conflict in mere daring and hardihood. Upon the whole we think more of David than of Samson in reading the account of this bold adventure, for it is not unlikely that, relying upon his prowess and the help of God, he may, in like manner, have conducted his flock to a dangerous pasture, fearless of the consequences. There was a plain called 'the Plain of Lions,' frequented by many ferocious animals and wild beasts. Not a servant of the tribe would venture near this place with his cattle; but Antar, knowing the grass here grew to the height of a man, determined to conduct his herd thither:—

'As soon as Antar found himself in it, he said to himself, "Perhaps I shall now find a lion, and I will slay him." And while the cattle were feeding, and he, from a mound, was looking around on all sides, behold a lion appeared in the middle of the valley; he stalked about and roared aloud. Wide were his nostrils, and fire flashed from his eyes. The whole valley trembled at every gnash of his fangs. He was a calamity, and his claws were more terrific than the deadliest catastrophe. Thunder pealed as he roared—vast was his strength, and his force was dreadful. Broad were his paws, and his head immense. As soon as he appeared in the valley, the cattle scented him, and fled away in terror, and the camels were dispersed to the right and to the left.

'No sooner did Antar perceive this extraordinary commotion than he descended into the valley, that he might observe what was the cause, brandishing his sword. He there saw the lion, terrible in his strength, and lashing his sides with his tail. Antar cried out to him, and the mountains re-echoed to the cry: "Welcome, thou father of lions—thou dog of the plains—thou foulest of the wild beasts of the deserts. Now, then, thou wilt exert thy power and thy might, and thou wilt pride thyself

Digitized by Google

self in thy roar; for, no doubt, thou art the monarch and ruler of the brute creation, and all obey thy commands—but return to filth and contempt, for now thou meetest no common man. I deal death to the bravest, and render children orphans. Dost thou think, foul-mouthed beast, that thou canst frighten me with thy roar, or alarm me with thy bellow? I will not deign to slay thee with the arrow or with the sword, but I will make thee drink of the cup of death from my single arm."'

This was not all, for as the hero advanced he addressed the lion in verse much in the same strain. Indeed it is the custom throughout the book for the heroes, before closing in combat, to accost each other in boastful and threatening verse, strongly reminding one of the interchange of stern compliments between David and Goliah. So in this instance Antar does not spare even the lion, but without in this case waiting for the usual answer, he cast away his sword and

'sprang forward and fell on him like a hailstorm, and hissed at him like a black serpent. He met the lion as he sprang, and out-roared his bellow.[f] Then, giving a dreadful shriek, he seized hold of the beast's mouth with his hand, and wrenched it open to his shoulders. Then he shouted aloud—and the valley and the country around echoed back his roar. He stuck to him until he was dead, and then dragged him by the legs out of the valley. He cut some wood, and taking out his *zanad*,[g] he struck a light and made a fire. He waited until it blazed: then he ripped up the lion, took out the entrails, and cut off his four legs, and threw them into the flames; and when he perceived that they were roasted, he took them out and ate thereof till he had finished his meal. He then ran to a spring, and drank till he was satisfied, and, having washed his mouth and hands, he went to a shadowy tree, where he put the lion's head under his own as a pillow, and wrapping up his head in a part of his sleeve, he fell asleep.'

This surprising adventure had the effect of deterring his father and others, who had witnessed it at a distance, from executing the design they had formed of destroying him. It is altogether a most wonderful description. The description of the lion is we think unequalled in literature, and that of the combat is scarcely inferior. The effect of some of the incidents is lost upon readers unversed in Oriental usages. This is indeed the case with many of the quotations we make; and as our object is only to point out the details which have something analogous in Scripture, we usually abstain from elucidating the other particulars. But to show how much lies in circumstances which escape ordinary notice, we may in this instance point out two facts in the last sentence of the above quotation. Antar washes his hands *after* he has eaten, in conformity with the universal eastern custom of handling the

[f] This is fine and true—the lion roaring as he springs.
[g] Touch-wood used for the purpose of striking a light.

food

Digitized by Google

food and conveying it to the mouth with the hand. He wraps his head, because the Arabs never sleep with the head or face uncovered; and that he does this with part of his sleeve, shows that the Arab shirt, which probably formed his sole robe, had then the same long and large sleeves as at present.

It is now time to say something of Antar's love, seeing that it becomes mixed up with his history, and is connected with many of the facts and much of the poetry from which our illustrations must be drawn.

The lady in whom his affections centered was no other than the daughter of his father's and master's brother, Malik. Her name was Abla. The tents of the same family were of course together, and Antar's duty of presenting the women with camel's milk gave him sufficient opportunities of becoming acquainted with the perfections of Abla. She was, in fact, his cousin; and had his mother been not a slave but a free woman, he, according to the custom of the Arabs, would have had the prior claim to her hand. Although the passionate sincerity of the hero's affection is beyond all question, it must not be forgotten—although it has escaped the notice of the translator of 'Antar'—that this pretension to the love of Abla had no unimportant relation to his claim—which formed the great object of his early life, to shake off the taint of his slave-origin, and to obtain a place, as the *recognized* son of Shedad, among the high born chiefs of the tribes of Abs. To aspire to her, implied that he meant to claim and to establish that right to her which belonged to him as the son of Shedad, and which was only barred by his condition as born of a bond-woman, which condition he designed to remedy by compelling his father, by the force of his energies and talents, to acknowledge his sonship—and the chiefs to receive him as their equal. At present he was 'the son of the bond-woman,' an unrecognized Ishmael.

Now Abla, we are told, was younger than Antar; and was a mirthful damsel. 'She was lovely as the full moon, and perfectly beautiful and elegant. She frequently joked with Antar, and was very familiar with him, as he was her servant.' The first time she comes before us was after Antar had killed the slave of Prince Shas for oppressing a woman. She makes him give an account of this adventure, in hearing which: 'Thou hast acted most properly,' said Abla, smiling, 'and we are rejoiced that thou art safe, for thou knowest our mothers consider thee as their son, and we look on thee as a brother, on account of thy services.'

It must be known that there is nothing of which women in the East—and especially Arabian women—are more tenacious than of not allowing themselves to be seen by men with uncovered heads. Even where the women freely expose their faces, and are

Digitized by Google

are even indifferent to the exposure of their busts, the crown of the head, and the hair in its unfolded state, are most fastidiously concealed from view. To this there may perhaps be an allusion in the words of the apostle, in 1 Cor. xi. 5, with reference to the indecency of a woman's appearance with uncovered head. Now it happened that entering one day the tent of his uncle Malik with the milk, he found his aunt combing Abla's hair, 'which flowed down her back, dark as the shades of night.' Antar was quite astonished, and Abla, as might be expected, ran away as soon as Antar entered and had seen her—'her sable locks waving to the ground behind her.' This incident fixed the lot of Antar. He became agitated, and confused, and could pay no attention to anything.

Soon after this came round the time of pilgrimage to the holy shrine, and for the worship of the idols. This was a time of general peace and amnesty, and therefore—like the Jews when they went to render their services at the great yearly feasts, Exod. xxxiv. 23, 24—they left their wives and children behind them without fear that any harm would befall them. While they were away the young people amused themselves with dances and songs at a favourite spot. 'Abla was with them, richly dressed, playing and singing among her companions. She was decorated with necklaces and jewels, and her countenance was dazzling and blooming—more dazzling than the rays of the sun.' When Antar thus saw her in all her beauty and loveliness, he was overwhelmed with surprise, his tears flowed, and he addressed her in extemporaneous verse. The specimen forms a very fair example of the kind of poetry with which the romance is adorned—and which from the mouth of Antar excited the admiration of his contemporaries, and spread the renown of his eloquent tongue no less than of his arms, through the wide deserts of Arabia. Its general character, its language and its images, may remind the reader of some passages in Solomon's 'Song of Loves.'

'The lovely virgin hath struck my heart with the arrow of a glance for which there is no cure. Sometimes she wishes for a feast in the sand-hills, like a fawn whose eyes are full of enchantment. My disease preys on me, it is in my entrails. I conceal it; but its very concealment makes it known. She moves: I should say it was the branch of the tamarisk, that waves its branches to the southern breeze. She approaches: I should say it was the frightened fawn, when a calamity alarms it in the waste. She walks away: I should say her face is truly the sun when its lustre dazzles the beholder. She gazes: I should say it was the full moon of the night when Orion guards it with its stars. She smiles: and the pearls of her teeth sparkle, in which there is the wine for the sickness of lovers. She prostrates herself in reverence before her God; and the greatest of men bows to her. O Abla!

Digitized by Google

Abla! when I most despair, love for thee and all its weaknesses are my only hope. Should fortune or my father aid me, I will even yet requite myself by my fearless spirit for its vicissitudes.'

It was under the influence of these emotions that Antar made the dangerous blunder of serving Abla with milk before her own mother and the wife of his own father—the consequences of which we have already seen.

Soon after the affair of the lion, the chiefs of the tribe, at the summons of King Zoheir, set forth with all their dependents on an expedition, and the slaves were left in charge of the families—that of Shedad being specially committed to Antar, of whose prowess a very respectful opinion now began to be entertained in the tribe. During the absence of the men, the women made parties to the lake of Zatool Irsad, and enjoyed themselves highly. There was music, there was dancing, there were songs, apparently extemporaneous and suited to the occasion. In this part there are many descriptive touches on the beauties of nature which we do not often find in Arabian poetry—but the limitation of object obliges us to hurry over a very tempting portion of the book, with the remark that the damsels are represented as playing on cymbals, like the Hebrew maidens on the like occasions—and that the scene in its circumstances, though not in its object, reminds one strongly of the rural festival and dances of the daughters of Shiloh, as recorded in the last chapter of the book of Judges.

There was another analogy, for the party was, in the very height of its enjoyment, suddenly surprised by a hostile tribe, who in a moment seized the women and the virgins, made them prisoners, and placed them on their horses behind them.

Now was the time for Antar to shine forth—and shine he did. He soon broke the neck of the one who was making off with his Abla, and slew at least thirty of those who happened to be in the rear. On this fifty of the foremost turned back to bear down the hero, who on his part saluted them with a song. These songs, uttered on such occasions, seemed to serve Antar and the other heroes of that age the same purpose as the lion's lashing of his sides with his tail—to rouse up their own energies to the great task before them. There are so many of these songs, that we cannot give this one—as it is not among the best; but there is a point in it which we quote for the consideration of those who feel interest in what is called the 'wine question,' and who are thereby led to inquire earnestly into the nature of Oriental wines: 'Give me pure wine to drink, or let it be mixed: give it me old, that I may imagine it was made before the world. She comes and offers me to drink, in cups mantling like the Judas flower. Give me to drink, and let me hear the song that delights me.'

Antar

Digitized by Google

Antar was of course victorious. But the women, fearing to be blamed by their lords, engaged to keep this affair a secret: and Antar was quite willing to abstain from claiming the glory of this exploit. It was, however, soon found out after the return of the chiefs. Shedad observed among the horses some strange ones, and inferred that Antar had, in his wanderings, assaulted and slain such Arabs as he met with, and brought home their horses. Fearing the odium this would bring on the tribe, he became exceedingly enraged, and thrashed him cruelly with his whip, abusing him the while. But he who had conquered seventy warriors would not resist this wrongful treatment from his father. 'His father still beat him, and abused him, and he bore it all.' A very fine instance of that filial respect which we have already had occasion to notice. But Shedad's wife, Shemeeah, who had been so much displeased in the affair of the milk, had been quite won by Antar's gallant conduct, to which she and the other females owed their deliverance. She therefore could not endure to see him thus maltreated, but chose rather to make known what was intended to have been kept secret. She does this in very animated verse. Shedad was astonished. 'It is surprising,' he said within himself, 'they kept all this secret; and his submission to be bound by me—it is most wonderful.' Antar, notwithstanding the severity of his stripes, answers Shemeeah in verse better than her own, concluding with the words—'Men are of two kinds; one whose heart is of brittle glass—the other whose heart is of rock.' When he had finished, Shedad went up to him, released him, and begged his pardon—'for he felt convinced,' it is somewhat curiously added, 'that such wit expressed in verse and prose could not proceed but from an exalted warrior.'

Shedad begins to be really proud of his son, and behaved well on this occasion. At that moment a messenger came from King Zoheir, who saluted Shedad, and said—'The king, O chief, sends his salutation to thee, and requests thou wilt attend the feast he has prepared'—a fact which illustrates the custom, more than once indicated in Scripture, that messengers were sent to apprize the invited guests when the dinner was ready. Matt. xxii. 3.

Shedad took Antar with him. On entering the tent, the former assumed the place that belonged to him among the noblest of the chiefs, and Antar went and sat down among the slaves. After dinner, Shedad related the whole affair, which was certainly of great interest to all the parties present. He was even so warmed as to extol the great merits of his son, and did not forget to set forth the eloquence as well as the courage of Antar. Antar heard

Digitized by Google

heard all this, but sat still. The king warmly echoed Shedad's praise; and, as men are apt to do in such cases, said he had expected it all along; thereby, as it would seem, claiming credit for his own penetration in having on a former occasion taken the youth under his protection. The king then called him forward to his presence. Antar then advanced, kissed the king's hand, and presented him the wine-cup, and his heart was overpowered with joy and delight. At the instance of his friend, Prince Malik, he consents to give a specimen of his poetical powers, and utters a noble ode—warlike, but in which we discern no point suited to our purpose, except that towards the close we come upon the Scriptural phrase, 'Mayest thou, O king, live for ever!'

This composition wins him the applause of all present; and the king, calling him to him, gave him a robe, and thanked him. This robe, which, being from a king, was a robe of honour—such as we read of in Scripture—was a very high distinction for one in Antar's condition—indeed we can call to mind no other instance of its being given to a slave; and it is therefore no wonder that when he returned in the evening with his father, 'his heart bounded with exultation at the honours with which he had been favoured.'

Still, however, Antar remains a slave, and still he tends the flocks. But one day, not long after, when the princes were enjoying themselves at a pleasant spot, they were assaulted by a large party of the very same tribe to which belonged the men whom Antar but lately defeated. Their destruction or captivity was inevitable; when Antar, who was in that quarter with his flock, appeared for their deliverance. Some of the assailants, having witnessed his former exploits, were terrified at the sight of him, and trembled at the verses he 'roared out' as he engaged them. They were soon dispersed, and the princes delivered. As they went back to their tents, 'Antar preceded them like a lion,' repeating verses, which, being short, we are inclined to quote, as, notwithstanding the unseemly boasting, there are some noble sentiments and some psalm-like touches.

'I will not cease to exalt myself by my deeds till I reach Orion. Here I care not for those who abuse me, fearful of death and separation from life. But I will reduce my foes and my railers by force; and I will be patient under suffering and in praise. I will strive to attain what I desire till death snatch me away. I will arm my mind against worldly lusts, that I may be faithful and noble-minded. Whoever would check me, let him look to himself, wherever he may be hidden. My complexion is no hindrance to me, nor the name of Zebeeba,[8] when I exercise my courage against the foe. I will work

[8] His Negro mother.

Digitized by Google wonders

wonders and marvels, and I will protect myself against the tongues of evil men.'

This was heard by King Zoheir, who had by this time come to the aid of his sons, but found them already delivered. He afterwards gave an entertainment in his tents—rejoicing in the safety of his sons. 'He sent for Antar, and set him down by his side, and gave him to drink of his most delicious wines, and placed him on high among all his comrades, investing him with a superb robe worked in gold, girded on him a trusty sword, and mounted him on one of the finest Arab horses.' This was a full dress of honour—was almost the highest honour the king could confer on any. The robe, the horse, and the sword *together*, as at this day, and formerly in Persia (Esther vi. 8, 9), constitute the value of the distinction. The robe separately would have been a high honour—and a robe separately had before been given—but the horse and the sword conferred *rank* upon the hero, and brought him as near to the condition of a free Arabian chevalier as was possible till Shedad should acknowledge him for his son. It was impossible for one thus honoured to be sent back to the herd; and this the king very plainly told Shedad. 'From this day forward,' he said, 'I will not permit him to attend your flocks; now that he has distinguished himself by such glorious deeds. Let him now run the career of victory with the warriors of his country.'

Having brought the hero to this point of honour, we may leave him for the present, hoping on one or two future occasions to trace the points in his further career which appear to offer materials for Scriptural illustration.

TISCHENDORF'S GREEK TESTAMENT.

In resuming our notice of Dr. Tischendorf's recent edition of the Greek New Testament, we have first to speak of the critical authorities on which his text is based. In connection with these we shall be able to notice his labours in the publication of the text of various Biblical MSS., in which he has rendered such essential service to textual criticism. We shall also mention some points of interest or importance which we have ourselves observed relative to MSS., &c.

The notice which Tischendorf himself bestows on the MSS., &c.,

Digitized by Google

&c., is but brief: he states in a note that he thinks of publishing a volume on the subject of the MSS. of the New Testament, with especial reference to palæography. He also refers the reader to the *Wiener Jahrbücher*, 1847, *Anzeigeblatt für Wissenschaft und Kunst*, cxvii. 1-24, where he has given an account of his Biblico-critical travels, &c., under the title of *Rechenschaft über meine handschriftlichen Studien auf meiner Wissenschaftlichen Reise von* 1840-1844. He mentions that he has seen all the uncial MSS. of the New Testament except P Q V Z Δ, the text of all of which has been published, except that of V (which Tischendorf, however, includes amongst those published) twice collated by Matthæi, and H, which has not been accurately collated; as well as E of St. Paul's epistles (of no great importance) and the Moscow MS. called 'g' by Matthæi, K by Tischendorf and others.

In speaking of the Codex Alexandrinus (A), Tischendorf states that he personally examined it so as to form his judgment as to its age, &c., in comparison with other more ancient documents. He refers to what he had said on this subject in his Prolegomena to the Codex Ephraemi. *There* (p. 43) he has stated the result of his examination of the passage 1 Tim. iii. 16 in the Alexandrian MS.: we can fully confirm his statements, having often looked at the questionable reading (O C or Θ C) in company with others as well as alone, and sometimes with the aid of a powerful lens, sometimes with the naked eye. We feel confident that the real original reading of the MS. was ὃς and not θεος. Wetstein attributed the line which in some lights was visible on one side of the O (besides the modern black dot in the middle) to part of the transverse line of the letter Є on the opposite side of the leaf. Woide denied that this could be correct: he said (trusting rather to other eyes than to his own) that the Є was so situated that no part of it could be seen directly opposite to the O. Having repeatedly examined this leaf, we are confident that Wetstein was right and Woide (or rather his informant) mistaken. If the leaf be held up to the light the Є does *slightly* intersect the O, so that part of the transverse line might be seen through on one side of the O.

We believe that the text of this MS. as published by Woide may be *generally* relied on as correct, although errors have been pointed out of the confusion of ε and η, ω and ο.[a]

It

[a] 'In February, 1846, I very carefully collated the fac-simile of Woide throughout the Epistle to the Ephesians with the MS.; in doing which, I first examined each letter by means of a magnifying glass, in order to be fully satisfied as to each letter, and then went over the whole again without a glass. This part of the MS. (as

Digitized by Google

It is well known how desirable is an accurate collation of *the* Codex Vaticanus (B): the three collations which exist are in several places discrepant, and thus a critic is often at a loss as to the evidence of this important document. Tischendorf states in his *Preface* to this edition that he thinks it probable that Pope Gregory XVI. would have allowed him to publish the MS. had it not been for the obstructions of Cardinal Lambruschini. How earnestly do we wish that he had accomplished this object! Tischendorf may be right as to the true cause of the hindrances which were thrown in his way at Rome: we say this from some personal experience.

Tischendorf has used the three existing collations of this MS. —those of Bartolocci, Bentley, and Birch.

The collation of Giulio *di Santa Anastasia* (the name under which *Bartolocci* entered the Benedictine order) is preserved amongst the MSS. in the Bibliothèque du Roi at Paris (No. 53). This MS. is evidently not the original collation, but a copy in which the transcriber has sometimes mixed the lines. The verses were originally omitted, but another hand has added them (not very accurately) in part of the MS. Opposite the beginning of the collation is written, '*Cette écriture est* PEUT-ETRE *de* LEON ALLATIUS;' and at the end a leaf is stuck in containing part of a letter from Bartolocci (dated 'Roma li ii Novembre, 1669'), in which he professes to have noted in the collation 'ogni minima variatione de' Testi;' the *fact* however is, that Bartolocci's collation is very imperfect. The first who made any critical use of it was Scholz; Muralt procured a transcript of it; and Tischendorf used it in comparison with the other collations. We copied it at Paris into a Greek Testament, in which we had previously inserted the two other collations with indications of their points of difference.

The next collation was that executed for Bentley when he was engaged in his long-designed edition of the New Testament which never appeared. Tischendorf speaks of this collation as having been procured by Thomas Bentley for his uncle, and made by the hand of an Italian named Mico. It appears, how-

---

(as perhaps you remember) is in very bad condition, and the writing in some place very illegible: the result, however, is that I have found only two letters wrongly given, with some errors as to the punctuation: viz. as to the letters, chap. iv. verse 1, the MS. plainly reads εκληθητε, not -θητε; and, in verse 2, as plainly παραΤητος, not -θητος. I remain, &c.,

'J. LINNELL, Jun.'

We insert this communication from Mr. Linnell as an important testimony to the general accuracy of Woide's edition—a testimony which we believe our readers will be glad to possess; many will also, we think, be interested in finding an *artist* paying so much attention to Biblical criticism.

ever,

Digitized by Google

ever, from Bentley's Correspondence,[b] that Dr. Thomas Bentley was not sent to Rome by his uncle, although when there he did many things for him, and also that this collation was finished by Mico before Dr. Thomas Bentley reached Rome. In a letter dated Rome, Aug. 2, 1726, Dr. Thomas Bentley writes thus to his uncle:—

'I have seen most of the Testaments in the Vatican. The finest and oldest is of all the Bible, which I suppose is that Mico collated. Had you a collation of all the New Testament from him? The writing is not unlike that of the Alexandrian MS., only there 's a gentle division of words. As to the accents, I can answer you with certainty, that they are added by another hand, but an old one. The person that added them has also taken a strange piece of pains to retouch every letter in the book; one side only sometimes, when he thought the other side very plain; also when he thought a letter superfluous, as in εσθειετε, ρειψαντες, &c., he leaves the ε untouched. I will get you a pattern of the writing as well as I can imitate—'tis thus [the words ΗΡΞΑΤΟ ΕCΘΕΙΕΙΝ are then given in a *very rude* imitation of the MS.]. The first writing is very white, but 'tis very legible. When I had got the book into my hands, I spent near the whole time of the library in it: 'tis writ by one that understood very well, and has no such faults as put a man out of humour. I send you the collation that you may see whether 'tis the same with Mico's. I opened at random, and fell upon the latter part of the Acts, so began the 27th

[b] 'The Correspondence of Richard Bentley, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.' London, 1842, 2 vols., 8vo.

This *valuable* work was in part prepared for publication by the late Rev. John Wordsworth, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. On his decease, the last day of 1839, his brother, the Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. (now Canon of Westminster), continued the labour, thus presenting important materials to the critical student. It is only from these volumes that Dr. Bentley can be rightly apprehended as to his critical powers; the reader, however, often regrets that more of Bentley's own letters to some of his correspondents have not been preserved. We shall have occasion frequently to cite from these letters, or to allude to them.

In vol. ii. p. 698, Dr. Wordsworth has inserted (with a mark of doubt) a restoration of an inscription of Jupiter Urius, and at p. 711, an answer to an inquiry as to the meaning of 'Yonane' in the date of a MS. sent from Persia. These papers had been published at Cambridge in 1742, in Dr. John Taylor's 'Commentarius ad Legem Decemviralem de Inope Debitore,' who says that he received them from *Aristarchus Cantabrigiensis*. Dr. Wordsworth, after stating who have ascribed these productions to Bentley, adds that others have attributed them to Dr. Charles Ashton, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge. Taylor says distinctly that *both* were written by the SAME *Aristarchus*. We can, however, set the question at rest. *Suum cuique;* they do *not* belong to Bentley. We have the statement of the very person for whom the answer relative to the era of Yonane was written—'At de æra Younanes, mihi haud minus quam amico [Samueli Palmer sc. qui codicem ad Ridleium miserat] incognita, dum, quæ sit hærebam, facillime me expedivit vir summæ eruditionis, nuper Collegii Jesu apud Cantabrigienses Præses ornatissimus.' [Ad imam paginam additur, '*Carolus Ashton, D.D.*']—Glocester Ridley's 'Dissertatio de Versionibus Syriacis,' Semler's reprint, p. 255. This settles the question. Farther on Dr. Ridley corrects the error which he had made when sending the inquiry to Cambridge, by which he had called the MS. *Persic* instead of Syriac, an error which stands at the head of the letter, p. 711, in 'Bentley's Correspondence.'

ch.

Digitized by Google

ch. I collated it with Rob. Steph. ed. fol. M.D.L.; 'tis generally better I think.'—Bentley's *Correspondence*, vol. ii. pp. 669, 670.

This is the last of Thomas Bentley's letters to his uncle which we have; so that we gain no further information from him on the subject of this collation. There can, however, be no doubt that it was the same MS. which had been collated by Mico some time before. In a previous letter (March 25) Dr. Thomas Bentley says, 'Mico is dead, but there 's an able young man in his place' (p. 653): the collation had evidently been sent to England some time previously. Bentley, however, was not quite satisfied with the collation; and the last letter in his 'Correspondence' on the subject of his New Testament shows that he wished to have the readings *à primâ manu* carefully distinguished. This letter is from the Baron Philip de Stosch, and he says, 'Voyez les dernières feuilles de la collation de l'Abbé Rulotta des interlinéaires et marginales du MS. Vatican du Nouveau Testament' (p. 706). He then speaks of a proposition which the Abbate Rulotta made to re-collate the whole MS. for Bentley, offering to do it for *ten scudi* less than had been paid for that already executed. Unhappily we do not know what has become of the collation of the marginal and interlineary readings which the Baron de Stosch transmitted to Bentley.

The collation made by Mico (although he often gave the readings of a later hand instead of those which were *à primâ manu*) is decidedly the most complete which we possess. The readings of the Gospels of Luke and John were transmitted by Woide to Birch, who published them with his own collation of the rest of the MS.: the whole was copied by Woide for insertion in the Appendix to the Codex Alexandrinus, which (after his death) was edited by Ford, in 1799.

The third collation is that of Birch, made during his critical travels. He collated the whole New Testament part of the MS. except the Gospels of Luke and John, with regard to which there was probably some hindrance: the whole appears to have been executed hastily. This was the first *published* collation of the MS.: the readings of the Gospels (with those of Luke and John sent by Woide) appeared in Birch's edition of that part of the New Testament in 1788, and also in his *Variæ Lectiones ad Evangelia* in 1801: the various readings to the Acts and Epistles appeared in 1798.

An attentive comparison of these three collations shows how important it is for their discrepancies to be corrected by a thorough collation of the MS. (if obstacles could be removed), or by an *accurate* publication of its text.

Besides these three collations Tischendorf has also used his own observations during the short time in which he was allowed to

Digitized by Google

to inspect the MS. at Rome. His own description of the MS. appeared in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1847. Besides this he also mentions that in some passages of doubt Cardinal Mai has replied to his inquiries. He refers to two passages, of which the correct reading is given in Tregelles's 'Prospectus of a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament now in preparation.' These passages are, Rom. v. 1, where the original reading of the MS. was εχωμεν, changed by a later hand into εχομεν by writing a small ο over the ω. Rom. viii. 11, where the MS. reads δια το ενοικουν αυτου πνευμα. Tischendorf adds in a note that he does not think in either of these passages the authority of this MS. would make the evidence preponderate in favour of the reading now given. At this we are surprised; for in Rom. v. 1 the only uncial MSS. which can be cited in favour of εχομεν (the reading he adopts) are F and G, in which ο and ω are so *habitually* confounded that they have but little weight *on such a point*. The versions which he cites in support of this reading are the later Syriac, Æthiopic, and Sclavonic; while εχωμεν in the reading of A B* C D J K and the Vulgate and other Latin versions, the Coptic, Syriac and Arabic, and very many Greek and Latin Fathers. In Rom. viii. 11, the reading which B now confirms, has not indeed *as* preponderating a weight as in the passage just discussed, but still we think the evidence of B D E F G J K, the Vulgate and other Latin versions, Syriac, Sahidic, and Arabic, to be quite sufficiently preponderating.

The readings given at the foot of Tischendorf's pages are the *results* of the three collations, and they appear to have been arranged with care. In some places, however, we are left in some doubt as to the statement of the readings: thus, Eph. i. 15, he gives την αγαπην as *omitted* by B (as in A); the collation of Bentley gives αγαπην as omitted indeed in the usual place, but *added after* ἁγιους (*ut videtur*). Bartolocci and Birch have observed the omission, but they say nothing of the insertion of the word elsewhere, which might be easily overlooked. Lachmann has used the collations of both Bentley and Birch, and yet he has *omitted* την αγαπην altogether, having apparently not observed how the reading is given in Bentley; and this omission has been made a subject of censure with regard both to his edition and his critical principles: hence it is of importance to state the evidence fully: if Tischendorf could have set the question at rest, it would have been well to have done so.

In Eph. iii. 5, αποστολοις is omitted by both Bartolocci and Bentley, though unnoticed by Birch. Tischendorf is silent as to this reading; perhaps, however, he has intentionally passed over variations of this kind. In speaking of Muralt's Greek Testament,

Digitized by Google

ment, as noticed by Tischendorf, we pointed out one passage, Luke xxiii. 39, in which the latter evidently mistook in his transcription of Bartolocci's MS. collation.

The Palimpsest MS. at Paris, Codex Ephraemi (C) is the MS., by the publication of which Tischendorf rendered his most essential service to textual criticism. Wetstein's labour in collating this MS. in the state in which it *then* was, has been highly (but not too highly) estimated. Had he noted the readings which *agree* with the common Greek text as well as those which *differ*, and had he stated what words and letters were illegible, he would have done as much as was practicable, so long as no means were taken to revive the ancient Greek writing, over which the Homilies of Ephraem the Syrian had been written.

Wetstein's collation of this MS. was intimately connected with Bentley's critical labours. In the early part of the year 1716 Wetstein came to England, where he showed Bentley the extracts which he had made previously from Greek MSS. at Paris, especially the Codex Ephraemi. Bentley pressed Wetstein to publish these critical materials, at the same time offering his assistance. Wetstein wished Bentley to undertake the work himself, and this suggestion was supposed by Wetstein to have first directed Bentley's mind to the project of editing a Greek Testament ('de quo prius nunquam cogitasse videbatur'). In this idea, however, Wetstein was certainly mistaken, for Dr. Hare (in his *Clergyman's Thanks to Phileleutherus*) had directed his attention to this object three years before; and Bentley, in his letter to Archbishop Wake, dated April 15, 1716 (while Wetstein was still in England), gives an exact account of his plan for editing a Greek Testament from ancient MSS., and he shows that he had made some considerable progress in the work: he had already collated the whole of the New Testament in the Alexandrian MSS. with his own hands, which could hardly have been done *after* he had seen Wetstein's MSS. Probably the interest which Bentley took in the Codex Ephraemi was occasioned by the discovery that in the Epistles of St. Paul it so often confirms the readings of the Alexandrian MS. He tells Archbishop Wake that these Epistles were the first part of the Alexandrian MS. to which his attention had been drawn.[e]

Wetstein

[e] Bentley, in his Epistola ad Millium, showed how much attention he had paid to New Testament criticism as early as 1691 (just two years before Wetstein was born). He also speaks of the importance of publishing the text of ancient MSS., which, it seems from what he says, Mill intended to have done *after* his New Testament should be completed. This was prevented, as he survived its publication but one fortnight.

In 1723, Conyers Middleton complained that Bentley had detained MSS. from the

Digitized by Google

Wetstein at this time had only made some extracts from the Codex Ephraemi—Bentley says, 'above two hundred lections;' and that great critic was desirous to possess as accurate a collation as possible of the whole MS. Accordingly he sent Wetstein to Paris to make this collation, and from some of his letters to Bentley we learn the difficulty which he had to encounter. In his first letter from Paris (19 Juillet, N.S., 1716) he says:—

'J'ai considéré un peu le MS. d'Ephrem, mais je ne sais si ma vuë a été hébétée depuis, ou par quelle autre fatalité j'aurai mille peines à y découvrir quelque chose de nouveau, à moins que je puisse me servir surement de votre secret pour faire revivre les lettres. J'y apporterai toute l'attention et exactitude possible; c'est sur quoi vous pouvez compter.'

In his next letter, Paris, ce 29 Juillet, 1716, he still speaks of the difficulty of his undertaking:—

'Je continue depuis de mon mieux à examiner le MS. d'Ephrem; je n'y perds pas mon tems à mon avis, y trouvant plusieurs choses qui avoient échappé ma vuë la première fois, particulièrement touchant l'ordre des paroles: au reste, c'est un ouvrage très difficile, de sorte *qu'il me faut ordinairement presque deux heures pour lire une seule page:* vous voyez par là que je consommerai tout mon tems à ce Livre tout seul.'

On the 19th of August (N.S.), 1716, Wetstein wrote to Bentley, mentioning that his leave of absence as a Dutch army chaplain was nearly expired, and that he must return to his post unless otherwise employed. He then says:—

'Interim omni mentis corporisque acie intentus sum in MS. Ephraimi, in quo laborem licet improbum at meo judicio non pœnitendum colloco, neque putem plus juste me tibi promittere, si dicam observationes tertiam partem jam auctiores fore: postquam transmisero judicabis de utilitate incepti operis, de difficultate non potes qui codicem non vidisti, et vix alii poterunt etiamsi viderint.'

Bentley wrote in reply (Aug. 29):—

'I can desire you to do no better than what you are doing already. The Ephraim exact by your hand will be well worth all the money it cost me.'[d]

Wetstein

---

the Public Library, some for eleven years, some for eight, and some for shorter periods. This seems to have been for his Greek Testament labours. Amongst other MSS. was the Codex Bezæ, which Bentley had thus kept for seven years, and which he appears to have sent back about the end of 1722. Some of the terms during which he had detained MSS. go farther back than Wetstein's visit to England.

[d] Bishop Monk says (Life of Bentley, vol. ii. p. 121, 2, note), 'It must be confessed that the pecuniary value which he [J. J. Wetstein] placed upon his labours was rather high; as it appears the doctor paid him 50*l.* for the collation of the MS. Ephrem just mentioned.' Had Bishop Monk *seen* the MS., so as to judge of the intensity

Digitized by Google

Wetstein wrote to Bentley from Bois-le-duc, Nov. 3, 1716, informing him in whose hands he had left the collation at Paris, and how he would receive it; and on April 14 (O.S.), 1717, Bentley wrote to Wetstein to acknowledge its receipt: he says in the close of this letter:—

'Whatever you send me of collations from the oldest Greek or Latin MSS. shall be thankfully acknowledged as well as honourably rewarded.'

Wetstein subsequently furnished Bentley with some other aids, especially in procuring for him the *Codex Augiensis* (F of St. Paul's Epistles). Their intercourse seems, however, to have ended soon after this. Wetstein refers in his last letter to Bentley to the wearying effect of his collations:—

'Durissimum enim foret, si post tot insumtos labores, et studium plurium annorum indefessum, quale in hoc genere literarum requiritur, in incertum movendo, nihil reportarem nisi oculos hebetes,[e] animumque ad alia studia ineptum.'

Such, then, were Wetstein's labours in the collation of this MS., labours which deserve to be remembered even though they have now been superseded by those of Tischendorf.

For about one hundred and twenty years the MS. remained at Paris, occasionally examined by a critic, but without anything having been done to bring the ancient writing more plainly to light. No use was made of Bentley's secret (whatever it might have been) for reviving the faded letters of the Palimpsest.

At length in 1834 and the following year, at the request of Fleck, Mons. Hase (ancien conservateur des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi) caused the Giobertine tincture to be applied

---

intensity of labour on Wetstein's part to collate it, or had he fully considered the Correspondence (especially the above sentence of Bentley's), he probably would not have thought the pecuniary value of Wetstein's services had been set too high. See also the next extract from Bentley. Bentley had collated MSS. himself, and he therefore understood practically the kind of labour which it demands.

[e] It will be observed that Wetstein frequently alludes to the wearing effect which collating had on his eyes. To be able *properly* to examine an ancient manuscript requires an amount of experience (such as few have any idea of), before the eye is sufficiently *exercised* in tracing distinctly the faint lines and letters; and when a sufficient degree of exactitude of eye has been obtained, the close attention required produces just such effects as Wetstein has described. '*Parce oculis tuis*,' was the exclamation of a kind librarian at Munich, Dr. Harter, who saw us engaged in the collation of one of the almost obliterated pages of X, on which he felt sure that nothing could be read.

In this Codex X, the order of the gospels *now* is—*John, Luke, Mark, Matthew*; but *before* the beginning of John there stand two injured leaves (to one of which we have just alluded) which Tischendorf seems to have quite overlooked. They contain part of Matthew, commencing chap. vi. 3 (in fragments of lines at first), and ending at verse 10. Also, in the *commentary*, Matt. v. 45 is found. Scholz's statement of the commencement of this MS. is thus partly correct and partly incorrect, for the MS. does *not* commence at v. 41.

to

Digitized by Google

to the MS., so as to re-exhibit the ancient writing. This process has enabled Tischendorf to do what Wetstein could not.

From December, 1840, till September, 1842, Tischendorf was engaged in transcribing and examining the MS. The printed edition appeared in 1843. In this the text is exhibited line for line and page for page in undivided capitals: the Greek letters do not in any way resemble those of the MS. itself. In an appendix Tischendorf has given those readings of later correctors which are found in the MS.: the text containing the original readings so far as they are legible.

The Prolegomena give a history and description of the MS., with an account of Tischendorf's own labours in copying and editing the text. At the end there is a beautifully executed fac-simile of one page, exhibiting the older writing in a blue colour (as produced by the chemical process), and the more modern in black.

By this fac-simile, however, Tischendorf has hardly done himself justice; for it looks as though it would be a comparatively easy thing to read and copy with accuracy the older blue writing. One thing, however, the fac-simile does not give—the stains in the vellum since it was subjected to the chemical process. It is true that much can now be read which was wholly invisible in the days of Wetstein, and yet the difficulty which Tischendorf had to encounter in his work is one which we could not have appreciated had we not examined the MS. in its present state. The value of Tischendorf's labour in the result, is, we believe, thoroughly estimated by all competent scholars; the difficulty which he has surmounted is known we think only to the few who have seen and examined the MS. itself.[f]

In 1846 Tischendorf published other Greek Biblical documents under the title of 'Monumenta Sacra Inedita.' This volume contains the text of *nine* MSS., most of them, however, fragments. The most important part of the volume is the MS. of the Gospels L (in the Bibliothèque du Roi, Paris, No. 62). This MS is important from its text harmonizing in a remarkable manner with

[f] The Codex Ephraemi contains fragments of the LXX as well as the greater part of the New Testament. In 1845 Tischendorf published these Old Testament fragments in the same manner as he had done the New Testament. This volume contains a notice of a few errata in the New Testament, which were occasioned by his absence from Leipsig when the book was printed.

During his travels he found fragments of a MS. of the LXX of extreme antiquity. He has published these in a lithographed fac-simile, showing the text of the MS. (which is remarkable as having *four* columns on a page), with all the corrections, &c. which have proceeded from later hands. The title of this publication is 'Codex Friderico-Augustanus, sive fragmenta Veteris Testamenti e codice Græco omnium qui in Europa supersunt facile antiquissimo.' Leipsig, 1846.

the

Digitized by Google

the most ancient documents. Wetstein collated it, but not very accurately; for this he has been severely censured. In fact, Wetstein was rather a collector of readings *out of* MS. than a collator, until Bentley sent him back to Paris to collate the Codex Ephraemi, and then he had no time to re-examine this Codex. *All* Wetstein's *early* collations (before he was twenty-three) are of the same hasty character. Griesbach re-collated it with some care; this was indeed the only MS. which he examined throughout.

Tischendorf copied it during his stay at Paris, and has by its publication rendered good service to criticism. The Greek type used in this volume has a greater resemblance to the ancient forms than that employed in printing the Codex Ephraemi. At every opening of the page of the text of L, we find the contents of as much as three pages of the MS.; the arrangement, however, is peculiar and very inconvenient, for instead of three *complete* pages being given at each opening of the book, we find two complete pages with *parts* of two others. Thus p. 205 of the printed volume commences with folio 112 of the MS., then on the same page are the first twelve lines (of both columns) of folio 112 *verso*, of which the other thirteen lines are on page 206, followed by folio 113. As the MS. is in two columns it becomes needful to turn the pages forward and *backward* and forward again, to read the divided page. The printer might have avoided this inconvenience by commencing on a *left hand* page.

In the same volume is contained the text of other Codices—the purple fragments I (in the British Museum), N (at Vienna), and Γ (in the Vatican). These have been treated by critics as separate documents, but Tischendorf shows that they are actually parts of the same MS. The entire number of these leaves is only twelve; of these six are at Rome, four in London, and two at Vienna.

The Barberini fragment Y (six leaves), and the Paris fragment W (two leaves), which are given in this volume had before been very imperfectly collated by Scholz.

In the margin of the Coislin MS. of the Octateuch some passages from the New Testament are written. Wetstein used two verses from the Acts, and thus gave the MS. a place in his catalogue. Tischendorf has published from the same source some other verses. In the Acts Wetstein designated this MS. F; Tischendorf accordingly denotes it F^{a} throughout the New Testament. F in the *Gospels*, it will be remembered, is the Codex Boreelii now at Utrecht, which after a disappearance for about two centuries came to light about twenty years ago; its readings have since been extracted and published by Heringa and Vinke.

Tischendorf

Digitized by Google

Tischendorf procured, during his travels, some fragments of a MS. containing part of St. Matthew's Gospel. To these four leaves the name Codex Tischendorfianus has been assigned; they stand first in the 'Monumenta Sacra.' This MS. is designated Θ.

The last document which is given in the same volume, is the Codex Basilianus 105 (B of the Apocalypse) now in the Vatican, No. 2066. Some readings from this MS. were sent to Wetstein; but they were so imperfect that it was thought that the MS. was probably very defective. In examining this MS. (which we were not allowed to *collate* throughout) we found that it contained the whole of the Revelation. As there are so few ancient MSS. of this book, an accurate collation of this Codex was much desired. Tischendorf was able to *examine* the MS. throughout; and he has given the text as well as he could under such circumstances. He does not give it page for page and line for line, like the other MSS. printed in this volume, but simply the text. He says in the Prolegomena to the New Testament which we have now under consideration (p. lxxiv.), 'In tantâ temporis brevitate nusquam errare difficile erat. . . . . Ibi paucis aliquot locis, certe duobus, errorem se deprehendisse, nuperrime indicavit Tregelles (A Prospectus of a Critical Edition, &c., p. 20), legendum enim esse xvi. 9 εξουσιαν non την εξουσιαν (quod vereor ne ipse male viderit) et xvi. 12 εφρατην non τον εφρατην.' Both of these corrections of Tischendorf's text of the Codex were taken from a *fac-simile* of the page. Tischendorf would not (we think) have doubted the omission of την before εξουσιαν, had he observed this. We give, however, from the fac-simile the three lines in which the reading occurs:—

μέγα·καὶβλασφήμησανὸιανοιτὸὄνομα
τοῦθῦτοῦἔχοντοςἐξουσίανἐπὶτὰςπλη
γαςταύ·τας καὶὸυμετενόησανδοῦναιἀυ

The letters stand thus: the final ς of ἔχοντος being under μ in the one line and above μ in the other; the initial ε of ἐξουσίαν has η above it and ε below it.

The mere list of the MSS. which Tischendorf has published will show how he has advanced that department of Biblical Criticism. Before this there had been published the Codex Alexandrinus, the Codex Bezæ, the Codex Boernerianus, the ancient Palimpsest fragments P Q and Z, the Coislin fragments (H. Epp.), and the Codex Sangallensis; also the Codex Laudianus of the Acts,—if the issue of so small an impression (now so rare) could be called publication.[5]

[5] In p. lxxxv., Tischendorf gives the place of publication 'Romæ,' instead of 'Oxoniæ.' He gives it correctly p. lxix.

Two

Digitized by Google

Two fragments, one of a Mount Sinai MS., which Tischendorf designates Λ,—the other a Palimpsest at Naples, which he calls R, have also been published in his *Rechenschaft* in the Wiener Jahrbücher. (R was previously used to denote a Tübingen fragment which Tischendorf states to be part of an Evangelistarium; he similarly uses O to denote some fragments at Moscow, instead of Montfaucon's fragment, which is also stated to be from an Evangelistarium.)

The former of the two *Codices Seidelii*[h] of the Gospels G and H, which afterwards came into the possession of Wolf, is stated by Wetstein to have been sent into England to Dr. Bentley by their last-mentioned owner: 'ipsumque tandem Codicem R. Bentleio in Angliam transiit.' Tischendorf queries this statement. Perhaps Wetstein might have heard of its having been sent to England (when added to the Harleian collection of MSS.), and thus *supposed* it was sent to Bentley. Wolf sent Bentley (Oct. 1, 1721) a *collation* of each of his MSS., and *this may* have been confounded with the MS. itself having been sent. In 1723 Wolf published a collation of both his MSS. (Anecdota Græca, vol. iii.), a collation, as far as G is concerned, remarkably imperfect and incorrect; indeed, it is surprising that any one could have made such errors as to a MS. in his own possession. The MS. commenced when Wolf published his collation at Matt. vi. 6, and so it does now.

In examining Bentley's books and papers in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, a few years ago, we found in that marked B. 17, 20, two fragments of vellum written in Uncial Greek letters, placed loosely in a piece of more modern Greek MS. in cursive characters. The Rev. John Wordsworth (who took great pains in describing, &c. Bentley's papers) says in the Catalogue, 'The two loose scraps are copies of some other MS.' It appeared, however, plain that they were really ancient fragments. Accordingly, we made a fac-simile of both: one of which struck us as certainly in the same handwriting as G which we had inspected several years before. On re-examining our fac-simile with G, this persuasion amounted to a certainty; the writing was identical, and in calculating the lines in a page, &c. this fragment would form half a leaf (the outer column being gone). It contains part of Matt. v. ver. 29-31, and 39-43. It thus appeared

[h] The Codex Seidelii of St. John's Gospel, of which Michaelis speaks (Marsh's translation, vol. ii. p. 215, note) as never having been collated, is one which has never existed. It is time to *weed* lists of MSS. of those things which ought never to have intruded into them. Bentley heard of this non-existent MS., and he wrote in 1721 to La Croze to procure him a collation of this supposed uncial document. It appears from the reply of La Croze to be only the Codex Seidelii H of the four Gospels.

that

Digitized by Google

that this half leaf was gone before Wolf described his MS. The other fragment answered very well to the description of H. It contained part of Luke i. ver. 3, θεοφιλε to 6 πασαις ταις—(the lines having all lost about ten letters at the end), and ver. 13 αυτον ο αγγελος to 16 εκ κοιλιας (the lines having similarly lost about ten letters at the beginning). This fragment is on thickish vellum, and it seems as if it had been cut round with a knife. How could these fragments get into Bentley's possession? Who could have been guilty of wantonly mutilating Greek MSS.?

Some years afterwards we observed the following passage in Wolf's letter to Bentley of Oct. 1, 1721. 'Ut de ætate ac conditione utriusque Codicis eo rectius judicium formari posset, adjeci specimina A et B signata, quibus in collatione ipsa designantur.' Could 'specimina' mean bits of the MS. themselves? We looked again at the fac-similes, and there indeed were the letters A and B (at the top of one and the bottom of the other); and thus it actually appeared that Wolf had himself been the mutilator of his own MSS.! This confirmed what we had not doubted before, that the fragment marked *A* belongs to the Codex G. Having thus brought home the charge of mutilating MSS. to Wolf by the coincidence of his statement with the discovery of the fragments themselves, of course we know how to understand what Wetstein says of H.: 'Specimen istius Codicis a possessore mihi missum vidi Amstelodami mense Januario, an. 1734.'

Much has been said of Wolf's lack of judgment, but what else proves it so convincingly as this?[1]

Tischendorf (as we have already observed) has not himself seen the MS. at Moscow, V of the Gospels, and K (Matthæi's 'g') of the Epistles. As, however, a question has arisen whether the Moscow MSS. were injured or not in the conflagration of 1812, the following letter may be of interest to some, as setting all uncertainty at rest.

'Monsieur,—Je me fais un véritable plaisir de vous communiquer en réponse à la demande que vous addresse L—— B——, que toute la précieuse bibliothèque du St. Synode à Moscou avec les MSS. et les archives, n'a rien souffert de l'incendie de Moscou, grâce aux soins du métropolitain Augustin, qui l'a fait transporter à l'abri de toute atteinte lors de cette catastrophe. Elle se trouve maintenant telle qu'elle a été à sa place. Il y a plusieurs anciennes copies MSS. du N.

[1] Michaelis, believing the account of the destruction of the MSS. at Alcala, says, (Marsh's translation, vol. ii. p. 441), 'Oh! that I had it in my power to immortalise both librarian and rocket-maker! . . . . The author of this inexcusable act was the greatest barbarian of the present [18th] century, and happy only in being unknown.' Had Michaelis been aware how Wolf treated his MSS., he might have bestowed all this reprehension upon *him*.

Digitized by Google

Test. dans cette bibliothèque, et même dans celle du Couvent *Troitzkoi*. Une notion assez détaillée sur ces MSS. se trouve dans l'édition du Nouv. Test. en Grec faite par *Griesbach*, dans l'édition *Halæ Sax.* 1796, 2 *vol. in* 8*vo.*, et dans *Chr. Fr. Matthæi accurata Codicum Græcor. MSS. Bibliothecarum Mosquensium Sanctiss. Synodi notitia et recensio. Lipsiæ.* 1804-5, 3 part. in 8vo.

'Les savans et les curieux ont toujours la permission de visiter et de consulter cette bibliothèque.

(Signed) 'ALEX. DE NOROFF.'

The Codex Claromontanus (D Epp.) has received such attention from Tischendorf as it deserves. He has transcribed the whole both in Greek and Latin, and offered it to the University of Oxford for publication (Proleg. p. xlv. note); this proposal was at the time *declined;* we are glad, however, to see that he still intends to give this important text to the public.

Tischendorf says of the Codex San-Germanensis (E Epp.) 'ex incendio abbatiæ S. Germani (in suburbio Parisino) ante hos triginta fere annos Petropolitanus factus,'—from which it might be supposed that it was carried to St. Petersburgh after the events of 1814 or 1815. It was there, however, several years before. Matthæi in his second edition of the Greek New Testament, vol. iii. (Ronneburgi, 1807) hints in the preface (p. 37, note) a *probability* that either D or E was then at St. Petersburgh. In an Appendix to the same volume (written after he had visited St. Petersburgh) he mentions that he had found the Codex San-Germanensis there, amongst the MSS. which Dubrowsky, a Russian noble, had purchased at Paris a few years before. Hence it must have been there a few years before May, 1805, when this Appendix is *dated*. This may perhaps serve to correct some erroneous statements which have been made on the subject in this country.

Two leaves of the Coislin fragments (H) of St. Paul's Epistles were missed after the fire at the Abbey of St. Germain, and these have now come to light at St. Petersburgh. The other twelve are in the Bibliothèque du Roi at Paris.

In speaking of the Codices Augiensis and Boernerianus (F and G Epp.) Tischendorf rightly states that they are not copies one of the other, but that both are transcripts of the same MS.; a conclusion at which from many proofs we had arrived. A statement of Tischendorf in giving the history of the Codex Augiensis requires correction. After speaking of Bentley having purchased the MS. in 1718, he adds, '*quinquennio post* a Thoma Bentleio legatus collegio S. Trinitatis.' The fact is, that the MS. was left by Bentley to his nephew *Richard* Bentley, at whose death, in 1786, it was bequeathed to Trinity College Library. Bentley's

Digitized by Google

two nephews have often been confounded; Thomas Bentley, LL.D., was the son of his elder brother James; he assisted his uncle in collations, &c. at Rome, and died in 1742, six weeks before him. The Rev. Richard Bentley, D.D., rector of Nailstone, in Leicestershire, was the son of Joseph Bentley, a younger brother; and to him his uncle left his books and MSS., expecting no doubt that he would publish some of his works: but though he survived his uncle forty-four years, he published nothing.

Wetstein's collation of F was very imperfect; he seems, indeed, to have only gathered readings from it during a very short time when he saw it at Heidelberg. Tischendorf re-collated it, but some of the readings in which its discrepancy from G are most strongly marked are not given by him. Thus, 1 Cor. xv. 24, G has the common reading τῷ θεῷ καὶ πρί, while F has the variation τῷ θεῷ καὶ πνι.[k]

The MSS. in cursive letters are briefly mentioned; those only being indicated which are sometimes quoted as authorities for various readings: Evangelistaria and Lectionaries are treated

---

[k] It is worth while to notice a reading in these two MSS., because of some assertions which have lately been published respecting it. In 1 Tim. iii. 16, these MSS. read ὃς ἐφανερώθη; an endeavour has been made to show that they really read ὅ, or at least that G does so. To prove this the following statement is made: 'Of it Le Clerc speaks in his Epistle to Optimianus prefixed to Küster's reprint of Mill's Greek Testament. *Codicem vidi qui fuit in Bibliotheca Franciana in hac Urbe anno MDCCV., venditâ, in quo erat O (nempe in 1 Tim. iii. 16) sed ab aliâ manu additum sigma. Codex est in quo Latina interpretatio Græcæ superimposita est: quæ his quoque habet* QUOD. In this Codex the alteration is betrayed, not merely by the fresh colour of the ink, and by the word *quod* placed immediately above the altered word, but by the difference in the size of the letters; for the corrector, not having room for a full-sized C, has stuck a small one up in the corner between the O and the letter E which follows, thus: O^{c}. Dr. Griesbach could hardly fail to be aware of this, yet he quotes G without any remark, as supporting the reading ὃς, not ὅ. The Codex F (Augiensis) was copied from G after it had been thus altered.' These statements require *proof*; because they differ widely from what we find in common authorities. Matthæi, who published the text of G, does not give the word ος in the manner described. Indeed in his Greek Testament there is a fac-simile of this very passage, with the word Oc thus, and not with the C stuck up in one corner, and the following ϵ is a good way off. If Matthæi was mistaken in this, we ought at least to be told so *plainly*, and also we should know *whose* examination of the MS. itself has brought the true reading to light. Again, we ought to be informed who has pointed out the fresh colour of the ink in the C, and also how it can look fresh after a lapse of about a thousand years—for that time must have passed *if* F were copied from G, after the alleged alteration took place. And why should Griesbach be blamed for not having mentioned what (even if correct) he was probably as ignorant of as ourselves? But in fact F is *not* a transcript of G; and F plainly reads OC; and as to Le Clerc's assertion, we believe him to be mistaken, and to have thought the original reading must have been ὅ because of the *quod* placed above it. *If* any of the new statements be correct, we ask for explicit testimony. We think that the statements to which we have referred as to the reading of G are not likely to be correct; the writer who has made them seems to know *peculiarly little* about the MS. We need hardly say that these remarks do *not* apply to *Tischendorf*, who gives the reading correctly.

with

Digitized by Google

with equal brevity. On one Evangelistarium only have we here any occasion to remark, and that simply because it has been supposed to be a MS. of the New Testament. It is important then to know that the *Codex Carpentoractensis* is simply an Evangelistarium.

In giving a list of the versions, Tischendorf briefly indicates the editions, &c. which he has followed. Under the Syriac he alludes to the remarkable Syriac version of the Gospels, which the Rev. W. Cureton intends to publish. We believe the *Versio Curetoniana* will not only be of peculiar importance as a Syriac document, but also as a most valuable contribution to Biblical Criticism. We say this as having some acquaintance ourselves with this Syriac text.

The *Latin* versions and MSS. demand and receive a considerable share of attention. Tischendorf uses his own collation of the Codex Amiatinus at Florence, and not that of Fleck, which is defective and incorrect.

Tischendorf uses the name 'Itala' (in common with others) to designate the Latin versions which are not identical with Jerome's translation. He briefly notices a few points in the history of this translation or translations. If the name 'Itala' be retained at all, it should certainly be applied to the *revised* copies of the old version; for it is to such that Augustine alludes in the sentence from which the name has been taken.

In the publication (1847) of the *Evangelium Palatinum*, a Latin MS. of the Gospels at Vienna on purple vellum, Tischendorf has added another to the authorities of this class, such as we before possessed in Blanchini Evangeliarium Quadruplex and Sabatier's Versiones Antiquæ. The history of this MS. is involved in some uncertainty; it may yet be discovered *how* it found its way into the Vienna Library, and also *whence;* if we obtain a more accurate knowledge of what Latin MSS. on purple vellum have ever been described, and what have been missed. The text of this MS. is in many parts very singular (e. g. John v. 4 *cata tempus*), and it bears the indications of that alteration of which we have spoken above. The printed edition is magnificent.

Tischendorf was not aware until too late that the text of St. Matthew in the Vatican MS. of the Latin Gospels (formerly at Paris) is published in Cardinal Mai's '*Scriptorum veterum Nova Collectio,*' vol. iii. He therefore takes its readings from Sabatier. Wetstein speaks of this MS. in writing to Bentley from Paris, 19 Aug. 1716. 'Vidi etiam P. Lequien Dominicanum (Editorem Jo. Damasceni) rogaturus ut ab Harduino Jesuitarum Bibliothecario amico suo Codicem antiquissimum IV Evang. commodato

Digitized by Google

commodato accipiat mihique utendum det: respondit Jesuitas, ex quo lis illis cum Montefalconio eam ob rem orta esset, nulli amplius libros suos concedere :[m] cæterum MS. illud continere nonnisi Evang. Matthæi perantiquum ex versione ante Hieronymum facta, charactere unciali exaratum: reliquos autem Evangelistas puram Hieronymi versionem exhibere scriptos manu imitante priorem, hoc est, manu impostoris, de Codice isto loqui Simonium.' The Jesuits, however, at length permitted the Benedictines to use the MS.; for Sabatier says (Versiones Antiquæ, vol. iii. pref. p. xxxv), 'Anni non minùs centum supra mille Claromontano codici [sc. Latino Evangeliorum] sunt tribuendi. Copiam hujus nobis fecere perhumaniter præfecti bibliothecæ Collegii Ludovico Magni R R. P P. Toubot et Languedoc. Codex ille Evangelii juxta Matthæum versionem Italicam continet,' &c. Cardinal Mai states that this MS. was purchased for the Vatican Library for a large sum by Pope Pius the Sixth. The suspicion, mentioned by Wetstein, that the other three Gospels had been added in this MS. 'manu *impostoris*,' is groundless; they are written in the same hand, although the *version* which they contain is that of Jerome.

For the readings of the Lectionarium Luxoviense, Tischendorf refers to Sabatier; he does not appear to have known that this very important Latin MS. is described in Mabillon, *De Liturgia Gallicana*, with a fac-simile in the Preface, and that in the Ap-

[m] There was no good will between the Benedictines and the Jesuits: the latter showed their animosity against the works of Augustine published by the former, whom they even accused of falsifying MSS. doctrinally. When De la Rue was engaged in preparing his edition of Origen, Bentley supplied emendations on the book περὶ εὐχῆς. De la Rue thus wrote to Bentley, 1 Jan. 1724:—'Certe ni malos timerem irritare crabrones qui me continuo ceu transfugam deferrent, istud περὶ εὐχῆς opusculum præmissa dedicatoria epistola clarissimo tuo nomine inscriberem; sed ex Walkero audies quam duro hic ceu Romanæ inquisitionis jugo premamur, Regiis, verius dicam, Jesuiticis, Censoribus in id unum intentis, ut cuilibet ex eorum sodalitio qui Bullam Pontificiam, quæ incipit *Unigenitus*, venerabundi non suscipiunt, causam aliquam inveniant quamobrem imprimendi venia denegetur.' De la Rue, however, honourably mentions both Bentley and Walker in his Preface.

The Bull *Unigenitus*, to which De la Rue refers, was fulminated in 1713 by Clement XI. against one hundred and one propositions drawn from the writings of Quesnel, which are condemned as false, dangerous, schismatical, heretical, &c. &c. The following are a few of the propositions thus anathematized:—'27. Fides est prima gratia, et fons omnium aliarum. 2 Pet. i. 3.'—'51. Fides justificat quando operatur, sed ipsa non operatur, nisi per charitatem. Act. xiii. 39.'—'76. Nihil spatiosius ecclesiâ Dei, quia omnes electi et justi omnium sæculorum illam componunt. Ep. ii. 22.'—'80. Lectio sacræ scripturæ est pro omnibus. Act. viii. 29.'—'91. Excommunicationis injustæ metus numquam debet nos impedire ab implendo debito nostro; numquam eximus ab ecclesia etiam quando hominum nequitia videmur ab ea expulsi, quando Deo, Jesu Christo, atque ipsi ecclesiæ per charitatem affixi sumus. Joan. ix. 22, 23.'—(Canones et Decreta Conc. Trid. *cum Appendice*. Romæ, 1845. App. p. 328, &c.) These then were some of the propositions which the Benedictines refused to condemn. Did the Bull anathematize the *texts* as well as the propositions?

pendix

Digitized by Google

pendix (p. 471-477) various readings are given. Porson in his letters to Travis speaks highly of this MS.

In giving the list of the Greek and Latin ecclesiastical writers who are cited as authorities, Tischendorf indicates those that have been particularly examined by himself.

We have, in the former part of our remarks on this edition, mentioned that the authorities are cited in the Gospels rather sparingly; we think that this will strike every one who uses the volume for critical purposes. Probably the editor has already thought that in the Gospels he was too brief in his citations, as he has in the latter part of the volume given the authorities far more liberally. Even at the risk of not making this a *manual* edition (*German manuals*, however, are often rather *bulky*), we wish that the variations in the MSS., especially those collated by Tischendorf himself, had been fully given. This would, we think, have far more than compensated for the increase of size and price.

The readings adopted by Lachmann are stated amongst the citations at the foot of the page. Tischendorf says that he might very well have omitted this, as he gives the authorities themselves; he adds, 'mihi . . . pariter atque ei testes antiquissimi summo loco habentur.' Others may, however, think that Tischendorf too much qualifies his regard for the most ancient authorities, and that the readings adopted by Lachmann are well worthy of attention, from his greater regard for *ancient* authority, and also from his having led the way in editing a text resting on it simply.[a] The limited range of evidence which he admits, and even this evidence having been incompletely gathered, are wholly different subjects for consideration.

As to Tischendorf's *Text*, we may simply say in general, that a text edited on good ancient authority *must be so far* valuable. We are glad to see the principle of recurrence to such authorities wherever it be found. The opinions also of one who has thus laboured in transcribing and publishing ancient MSS. ought, at least, to be treated with respect. We have already remarked on Tischendorf's critical principles, and the manner in which he has

[a] The priority would have belonged to Bentley, if his nephew, Richard, had published the Greek and Latin New Testament which his uncle had prepared; it must have been left to him for that purpose, for the money which had been subscribed passed, as well as the papers, into his hands. He returned the two thousand guineas to the subscribers, and allowed his uncle's labours to slumber in repose.

Lachmann did very little to *make known* the principles on which he edited the sacred text; and for all collection of authorities, and even for their *statement*, he is wholly indebted to others: as to critical *principles*, however, others have in a great measure *followed* him.

applied

Digitized by Google

applied them. The principles and their application must of course affect the general complexion of the text formed on them. That such a text must be incomparably superior to what is called the 'Textus Receptus' must, we think, be evident.

There are some, who, if they find a particular passage changed from the reading to which they have been accustomed, or if they find words omitted, at once raise a note of alarm and reject such a text as though it were profane. Such persons, if they hear a suspicion expressed as to the genuineness of the history of the woman taken in adultery (John viii.), exclaim that an attempt is made to cancel part of the word of God. Such may, if they please, reject Tischendorf's New Testament *at once*, and without examination. It is in vain to tell them that authorities must be weighed, and that the best and most ancient know *nothing* whatever of this passage, that ancient versions are without it, and that commentators evidently were wholly unconscious of its existence; and, farther, that some documents which do contain it cannot in the least tell where it belongs. If they once persuade themselves that it *must* be a part of the word of God, all such considerations are useless; they deem that it is profanity and presumption to differ from their subjective feelings. If they would discuss the *evidence*, and try to show that on that ground we should receive any such passage, the case would be wholly different. Perhaps some will listen to *Beza* on such a point, although they would give no heed to modern critics. 'Ad me quidem quod attinet, non dissimulo mihi meritò suspectum esse quod veteres illi tanto consensu vel rejecerunt vel ignorarunt. . . . Tanta denique lectionis varietas facit ut de totius istius narrationis fide dubitem.' If he could write this three hundred years ago, how must the argument be strengthened when so much more evidence has come to light against the passage.

The case is, we think, different with regard to the conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel. It is true that in the fourth century many copies were without it, but in the same century there were also copies which contained it; and these copies are confirmed by those important witnesses in the case of passages and clauses—the ancient versions in general. Also in the *second century* St. Mark's Gospel ended as it now does; and thus we regard the evidence on the transmission of this passage to be strongly in favour of its being the genuine work of the Evangelist. Still, *if* any one rejects it, we must meet him on the ground of critical testimony, and not that of ignorant subjective dogmatism.

If we were to give the text the examination which we should wish, we should take passages and analyze the readings, pointing out what authorities Tischendorf has followed, and how far he

seems

Digitized by Google

seems to us to have qualified the stated evidence by other considerations. To do this, however, would be to write a 'Commentarius Criticus' rather than a review; we may, however, recommend our readers thus to examine the text and the cited authorities for themselves. But we may direct attention to a few particular passages. In Col. ii. 2, he has now given the reading εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, omitting the words καὶ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ altogether. In this he follows Griesbach (as Scholz also had done); for the omission of all these words there appears to be no authority except six of the later Greek MSS.° And thus, whatever difficulty the variety of reading may occasion, it is too bold an expedient to remove the words altogether on which we have to form a judgment. The following are the readings of the uncial MSS. in this passage:—A and C, τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ; B, τοῦ θεοῦ χριστοῦ (and this is the reading adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf in his first Leipsig edition, and that of Paris dedicated to M. Guizot); D, *à primâ manu*, has τοῦ θεοῦ ὅ ἐστιν χριστὸς; F and G do not contain this part of the Epistle; J and K, as well as D, in a later hand, and E (the transcript of D after it had received corrections), read as in the common text. There is some variety in the versions, but *all* (we believe) have the clause in some form. This, then, is one of the passages in which we may be in some doubt as to the true reading, but in none that part of the clause at least is genuine; all authorities agree in the insertion of 'Christ.'

In another passage of some importance Tischendorf also followed Lachmann's readings in his former editions. This passage is Matt. xxi. 31. De Wette (*Einleitung ins N. T.*, 5 ed. p. 80) asks, with regard to Lachmann's reading, 'Was soll der Exeget mit dem blossen Lachmannschen Texte anfargen in Stellen, wo er sinnlos ist, wie Matt. xxi. 28-31?' This is pretty plainly assuming that Lachmann so reads the passage as to deprive it of its meaning. Lachmann in the parable of the two sons bidden by their father to work in the vineyard, retains the common order of the questions and answers (*i. e.* the *first* son refuses to work, but afterwards repents and goes; the second son promises to go, but

° To these Tischendorf adds '*Arm. Venet.*' He appears to have borrowed this reference from Scholz, who says that Zohrab's Venice edition of the Armenian (1805) had been collated for his edition by Cirbied, professor of the Armenian language at Paris, and by the Mechatarist monks at Vienna. The *fact*, however, is, that the Venice edition of 1805 reads—'the mystery of God in Christ Jesus.' There is a reference in the margin to the edition of Uscan, who reads, 'of God the Father in Christ Jesus.' (This the Venice edition of 1816 follows.) All that the collators ought to have indicated as omitted in the Venice edition of 1805, is the word '*Father.*' Griesbach does not give the reading of the Armenian text quite correctly as it stands in Usean, for he omits 'Jesus' at the end.

does

Digitized by Google

does not); but in the answer of the Jews to our Lord's inquiry, 'Which did the will of his father?' the reading ὁ πρῶτος is changed into ὁ ὕστερος. *This* was deemed by De Wette void of meaning; and though Tischendorf formerly adopted it, he now gives the common reading. In examining the authorities in this passage great discrepancy will be found; several have ὕστερος (or an equivalent) in the latter part, and then all difficulty is avoided by *inverting the order* of the answers, &c. of the two sons. Origen, however, is an explicit witness that the answers were then in the same order in which we now have them—the second son professing a willingness and not going, the former refusing and afterwards going. Hippolytus is a witness contemporary with Origen, that the answer of the Jews to our Lord was *the latter*, not *the former*. We believe that Lachmann gives the true reading of the passage, and that in some documents *the order* of the answers has been changed to avoid a supposed difficulty, and in others the word ὕστερος for the same reason. Transcribers felt persuaded that the answer of the Jews *must* have been that the son who really went into the vineyard *did* his father's will. Jerome appears to have translated 'novissimus,' a rendering which elsewhere answers to ὕστερος; this had been the Latin reading prior to the time of Jerome (as shown in the Codices Vercellensis, Veronensis, Corbeiensis, and the Evangelium Palatinum, published by Tischendorf); the best copies of Jerome's translation, such as the Codex Amiatinus, also retain it. Jerome in his Commentary appears to have felt the difficulty, and he appeals to other copies which read 'Primus' (such as the revised text contained in the Codex Brixianus); he seems, however, to have had but little confidence in the copies that read differently, for he tries to explain his own reading 'Novissimus:' he attributes this answer to the obstinacy of the Jews.

But what is to be said to this seemingly contradictory reading? The eldest son afterwards repented and did his father's will, and yet the answer is ὁ ὕστερος. We believe that ὁ ὕστερος refers not to the order in which the two sons have been mentioned, but to the previous expression about the elder son, ὕστερον δὲ μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπῆλθεν; *afterwards* he repented and went. 'Which of the two did his father's will?' ὁ ὕστερος, *he who afterwards* [repented and went]. This, we believe, answers De Wette's inquiry, and we wish that Tischendorf had retained Lachmann's reading, instead of adopting that of the Codex Ephraemi. When documents *avoid a difficulty*, and that in different ways, we may at once suspect that the supposed difficulty is at least worthy of examination. Some versions retain the common order of the answers of the sons, and then give 'the first' (as in the common text)

Digitized by Google

text) as the answer of the Jews. We do not think that this shows that they *must* have so read in their Greek copies; they appear sometimes to have done this to avoid ambiguity, and to show that the elder son was the one really intended.

In Rev. xxii. 14, Tischendorf's former edition had μακάριοι οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, on what we conceive to be ample authority; he has, however, now returned to the common reading; B (of the Apocalypse) *may* have influenced his judgment in this, but still we think the reading of A, the Vulgate, and other authorities very preferable.

In Rev. xviii. 3, the reading of the oldest authorities is,— ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς πέπτωκαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη; 'Because by reason of the wrath of her fornication all the nations *have fallen*' (see Jerem. li. 4, 49); this is found in later documents, with various changes. In some authorities, such as the Greek text from which Jerome's version was made (as shown in the Codex Amiatinus) πέπτωκαν, *have fallen*, is changed into πέπωκεν, *have drunk*. Also in some documents (most, indeed) τοῦ οἴνου is inserted before τοῦ θυμοῦ (as in Rev. xiv. 8); and thus the reading of the common text has sprung up: 'Because of *the wine* of the wrath of her fornication all the nations *have drunk*;' this is also the reading of the *modern* Vulgate, and this reading is *retained* by Tischendorf. The most ancient reading has, however, sufficient witnesses: τοῦ οἴνου is omitted by A and C, the Vulgate (in the best codices), and the Ethiopic. Tischendorf, however, omits C in his note, and says that τοῦ οἴνου is the reading of B, and apparently of *all* MSS. except A. And as to πέπτωκαν, that is the reading of A and C, while B and ten others have the cognate reading πεπτώκασι, and the Coptic and Ethiopic have the same.

In speaking of Tischendorf's principles in our former notice, we adverted to the importance of not supposing without competent *evidence* that parallel passages, *e. g.* those in the Gospels, have been altered for the sake of uniformity of reading. Each case must stand on its own ground. In addition to this, we have to point out the importance of not too easily supposing that a verbal resemblance *must* exist in similar sentences. Thus in Acts xv. 22, we have τότε ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις κ. τ. πρεσβ. σ. ὅλῃ τ. ἐκκλ. ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι, 'Then it pleased the apostles and the elders, with the whole Church, that having chosen men from among them they should send,' &c. (or 'to choose and send men from among them;' *not*, as in our common version, 'to send chosen men'); in the same chapter, ver. 25, we have the letter written on the occasion, ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν .... ἐκλεξαμένοις ἄνδρας πέμψαι, 'It seemed good to us ..., to choose men and send them;' this is

Digitized by Google

is the reading of A B G. Tischendorf, however, follows the common reading ἐκλεξαμένους, as supported by C D E H; although it can be so easily attributed to the *harmonising* tendency of copyists, and *here* the *varying* reading should surely be preferred, as supported by at least equal evidence. The *sense* is the same of both readings; but there is just this importance in the variation, that had the reading of A B G in ver. 25 been before our translators, they *could* not have joined together dative and accusative and rendered 'chosen men,' and this would have hindered them from supposing in ver. 22 that the participle should be taken in a passive sense, *agreeing* with ἄνδρας, instead of its governing it.

Some would perhaps expect to find in a text avowedly on ancient authorities, the addition at the end of Matt. xxvii. 49, of the words ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην, ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα. These words are, indeed, added by B C; but besides these two important authorities, they are only found in L and U, in five modern MSS., and in the Ethiopic version and the Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary. No other authorities have this addition; and we think the ancient authority of A D and the other MSS., and *all the versions* besides those above named, outweigh what can be brought in favour of inserting a passage which seems to come from the parallel place in St. John. Also the Eusebian canons do not recognise these words in Matthew; and the evidence of D *against an insertion* is strong from the nature of that MS.

It is well known that some have felt a timidity on the subject of textual criticism, knowing that it affects 1 Tim. iii. 16, and perhaps other passages which they have relied on in connection with the Godhead of Christ. We commend to the notice of such John i. 18, where, instead of ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, great authorities support the reading ὁ μονογενὴς θεός. This is found in B (as given by Bartolocci, and as observed in the MS. by ourselves), in C* L. 33. It is the reading of the *Peshito* Syriac version, Coptic, Ethiopic, the margin of the later Syriac; it is found also in many early writers, as Clement of Alexandria (twice), Origen (twice), Lucian, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, Epiphanius (frequently), Isidore of Pelusium, Cyril Alex. (frequently), Irenæus, Didymus, Basil of Seleucia, Titus of Bostra; and also Theodotus, Marcellus, Arius, Eunomius, &c.; and amongst the Latins, Hilary, Fulgentius, Gaudentius, Ferrandus, Phœbadius, Vigilius, Alcuin, &c. The common reading of this passage is not upheld by any *most ancient* uncial MS. except A (D is here defective); it is, however, found in the Latin *versions* (though some Latin *writers* have the other reading), the Armenian,

Digitized by Google

menian, the Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary, the later Syriac (text), and the Syriac Gospels brought to light by Mr. Cureton, and it is so cited by Origen in two places, by Eusebius, by Basil (three times), and Irenæus (once);—some of these writers have *also* the other reading—and most of the Latin writers; it must, however, be remembered that μονογενὴς might almost suggest υἱὸς as the word which should follow it, while θεὸς sounds peculiar; and as *one letter* would make the change (ΥC for ΘC), we have to consider which reading is most likely to have been the original, both from weight of evidence and the nature of the case. Does not external evidence preponderate in favour of θεὸς, and is not this confirmed by the character of the reading? No critical text has adopted this reading,[p] though we think that Lachmann would have received it, had he known that it is supported by the Vatican and Ephraem MSS.

Another passage bearing on the Godhead of Christ *indirectly* is given with a new reading in some critical texts. In 1 Pet. iii. 14, 15, there is a citation from Isaiah viii. 12, 13. In the prophet the words are, 'neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid; sanctify the LORD of hosts himself.' The citation of the Apostle exactly agrees with this, except that, in the corrected text, the latter clause runs, κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε, 'Sanctify the Lord CHRIST,' instead of the common reading, 'Sanctify the Lord God.' This correction is given as *highly probable* by Griesbach, and is adopted by Lachmann and Tischendorf. The evidence in its favour is most preponderating; for it is the reading of A B C and other later MSS., of the Vulgate, both Syriac versions, the Coptic, Sahidic, and Armenian; it is also cited by Clement and others, while τὸν θεὸν has no more ancient MS. evidence than G and J (at Moscow) of the ninth century, and is found in no older version than the Polyglot Arabic. The former may then be well taken as an *established* reading, and as such may be used *confidently*. It shows that the יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֹתוֹ 'Jehovah of Hosts Himself' in the Prophet, finds its New Testament exposition as an equivalent in κύριον τὸν χριστὸν, 'the Lord Christ,' thus marking the divine glory of our Lord in the most emphatic manner. And this is in thorough accordance with the Apostle's train of thought; for the following words of the Prophet, in which he says that Jehovah of Hosts should become 'a stone of stumbling and rock of offence,' had been previously applied by the Apostle (chap. ii. 7, 8) to the Lord Jesus.

We point out this passage as exhibiting an interesting *result* of

[p] Muralt's edition neither is nor professes to be a critical text; he merely seeks to give the text of the Vatican MS.

criticism.

Digitized by Google

criticism. Dogmatic grounds must not influence our minds in weighing *evidence;* but when the authorities have been weighed and a conclusion obtained, the doctrinal value of a corrected reading may be of no small importance; and this may commend critical studies to those who would otherwise fear the results to which they might tend.

RESTORATION OF THE CHRONOLOGY OF JOSEPHUS.

Few ancient historians have escaped corruption in the process of repeated transcription. The Bible itself, with all the sacredness that attaches to its inspired phraseology, is no exception to this lamented liability. The work of the celebrated Jewish priest Josephus seems to have fared no better than others, so that all attempts hitherto made to understand the scheme of chronology by which he was guided have failed of clearly eliciting it. His dates seem a mass of strange and almost inextricable confusion; so full of contradiction, that it is utterly impossible to conceive that an author so acute and accurate as he was, could have published them in their present state.

On the other hand, this discordancy is directly at variance with the main design of the history. The attentive reader cannot fail to observe how much it is his aim to furnish an ample and well-sustained system of Hebrew chronology, for he is constantly appealing to its aid as interesting to himself and essential to his design. He had evidently made this department of the historian's duty one of his principal studies, on account of the slanderous reports of contemporary Gentile writers, that the Jews were of very recent and ignoble origin. To prove the reverse, and uphold the high antiquity of his nation, Josephus was led to consult most critically not only the annals of his own people, but the records and other historical documents of those nations with which the Jews had held intercourse; from all which sources he produces incontestable proofs both of the existence and great eminence of the Jewish nation from the most remote antiquity.

Besides, he composed his history under the conviction that as soon as it appeared it would be eagerly seized and severely assailed by his enemies on the very ground of its chronology; and hence we find him continually fortifying the point that would sustain the chief assault. This gives the history a peculiar character.

Digitized by Google

racter. As a skilful surveyor takes numerous bearings from every new point of observation that he reaches, and often throws back his telescope upon those distant but well-defined eminences on which he has already stood, in order to ascertain correctly the position he now occupies; and when he enters on a region peculiarly beset with engineering difficulties, carries over it a double line of triangulation, in order that the one series of observations may correct or establish the other—so our author, as he reaches every great epoch in his history, looks back and carefully reminds his reader what times have passed since earlier events occurred, and how far he has now advanced in the history of the world; till when he arrives at the Exodus from Egypt, he commences a double line of dates which never once mingle from this grand diverging point till they meet at the final destruction of Jerusalem, where they exactly coincide. This latter singular feature of the history of Josephus, which does not seem hitherto to have been noticed, is one to which we intend to give merited prominence in the course of our remarks. Dr. Hales, and others who have founded their calculations on Josephus, have confounded the two series of dates with each other, and thereby made the confusion worse; but when separated, as they ought to be, it will be found that a considerable portion of the disorder disappears. The one of these series of dates may be called the civil chronology, because it stands connected with the civil history of the nation; the other the sacerdotal, as it is connected with the history of the priesthood.

These objects and efforts of the historian make it evident that he possessed a clear and well-accredited system of chronology, and that of course the fullest harmony reigned among his numerous dates when he first published his celebrated work. Ignorance and carelessness in the lapse of ages have done much doubtless to produce the discordancy now prevailing; but design has not been wanting, as we expect to show, in propagating the errors thus created.

In the present attempt to restore the original chronology of Josephus it is not our intention to touch upon the question so much associated with his name, of what is called the long and short chronologies.[a] We shall leave this difficult problem to

[a] We may simply state that there are only four terms throughout the history in which these disputed periods are contained, and in them the shorter computation is employed; but had the scheme of Josephus been the longer one, as seems most probable, these four terms may have been altered to suit the shorter view, without affecting any others.

abler

Digitized by Google

abler critics, and only deal with difficulties of a later age, the elucidation of which is of more practical utility. We begin therefore by quoting here in full those passages of Josephus in which his principal chronological references are contained, that the reader may judge the more easily of our strictures.

1. (*Antt.* VII. iii. 2.) 'Now the whole time from the warfare under Joshua our general against the Canaanites, in which he overcame them and distributed the land among the Hebrews—nor could the Israelites ever cast the Canaanites out of Jerusalem, until this time when David took it by siege—this whole time was 515 years.'

2. (*Antt.* VIII. iii. 1.) 'Solomon began to build the temple in the 4th year of his reign, in the 2nd month.....592 years after the Exodus out of Egypt, and 1020 years from Abraham's coming out of Mesopotamia into Canaan; but after the Deluge 1440 years, and from Adam, the first man who was created, 3102 years.'

3. (*Antt.* IX. xiv. 1.) 'So the ten tribes of the Israelites were removed out of Judea 947 years after their forefathers had come out of the land of Egypt and possessed themselves of this country, but 800 years after Joshua had been their leader, and, as I have already observed, 240 years 7 months and 7 days after they had revolted from Rehoboam and given the kingdom to Jeroboam.'

4. (*Antt.* X. viii. 5.) 'Now the temple was burned 470 years 6 months and 10 days after it was built. It was then 1062 years 6 months and 10 days from the departure out of Egypt, and from the Deluge to the destruction of the temple the whole interval was 1957 years 6 months and 10 days; but from the generation of Adam until this calamity befel the temple there were 3513 years 6 months and 10 days.'

5. (*Antt.* X. ix. 7.) 'The entire interval of time that passed from the captivity of the Israelites to the carrying away of the two tribes proved to be 130 years 6 months and 10 days.'

6. (*Antt.* X. viii. 4.) 'In this manner have the kings of David's race ended their lives, being in number 21, until the last king; who altogether reigned 514 years 6 months and 10 days—of whom Saul, who was their first king, retained the government 20 years, though he was not of the same tribe with the rest.'

7. (*Antt.* XI. iv. 8.) 'Before their captivity and the destruction of their polity they had kingly government from Saul and David for 532 years 6 months and 10 days; but before these kings such rulers governed them as were called Judges and Monarchs. Under this form of government they continued for more than 500 years after the death of Moses and of Joshua their commander.'

8. (*Cont. Ap.* I. 21.) 'In our books it is written that Nebuchadnezzar, in the 18th year of his reign, laid our temple desolate, and so it lay in that state of obscurity for 50 years; but that in the 2nd year of the reign of Cyrus its foundations were laid, and it was finished again in the 2nd year of Darius.'

9. (*Wars*,

Digitized by Google

9. (*Wars*, VI. iv. 8.) 'Now the number of years that passed from its first foundation laid by king Solomon till this its destruction in the 2nd year of the reign of Vespasian, are computed to be 1130 years, besides 7 months and 15 days; and from the 2nd building of it by Haggai in the 2nd year of Cyrus the king, till its destruction under Vespasian, there were 639 years and 45 days.'

10. (*Wars*, VI. x. 1.) 'The king of Babylon conquered it (Jerusalem) and made it desolate, 1468 years and 6 months after it was built by Melchizedek . . . . David the king of the Jews ejected the Canaanites and settled his own people therein; but it was demolished entirely by the Babylonians 477 years and 6 months after him; and from king David, the first of the Jews who reigned therein, to this destruction under Titus, were 1179 years: but from its first building to this its final destruction were 2177 years.'

These extracts contain 23 calculations, for the most part at considerable variance with each other; but, as a very small portion of our author's references, they exhibit the careful attention he had devoted to this branch of his undertaking, and his own conviction that they satisfactorily and clearly answered the purpose he had in view. It is also evident that he founded his chronology upon no one distinct era, but upon a series of great epochs occurring successively in the history of his people, and this is its great disadvantage. As, however, he has referred to the same epochs so often, they become the only means by which we may hope to detect the numerous corruptions that have been introduced among them.

In a former paper[b] upon the Chronology of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah we found that from the schism under Rehoboam to the destruction of Jerusalem was a period of 370½ years. This sum we showed from two remarkable quotations of Josephus (the 3rd and 5th above) was evidently his computation of the same period, and we stated that on applying it to the present discordant dates of his chronology, it would prove a key to discover the secret of the whole confusion, and of course the means by which it might be remedied. As, however, this period is often involved in numbers that reach back to remoter ages, and in others that descend towards the close of the history of the nation, it will be necessary first of all to settle a few questions connected with the earlier period of this history, and thus prepare the way for the better application of our test.

In the 2nd quotation it is stated that 'Solomon began to build the temple 592 years after the Exodus out of Egypt.' This

[b] In the last number of this Journal.

number

Digitized by Google

number seems to be uncorrupted, notwithstanding that Dr. Hales condemns it as spurious, and estimates the period at 621 years. Josephus never once departs from it in any calculation which involves this interval. Jahn adopts it, and assigns several conclusive reasons in favour of its authenticity, which may be seen in his history of the Hebrew Commonwealth. It has been accepted both by Vossius, Spanheim, Jackson, and Bishop Russell, and it agrees better than any other with the 450 years of the judges mentioned by Paul. The following calculations of Josephus fully bear out this opinion.

In the 1st quotation it is said, 'the whole time from the warfare under Joshua until David took Jerusalem by siege is 515 years:' the 592 years therefore must contain this interval. If, then, we deduct from its commencement the 40 years of Moses, and from its close, 34 years of the reign of David, on the supposition that he took Jebus the year before he made it his royal residence, with 3 years of the reign of Solomon, in all 77 years, we have exactly 515 years over for the interval given.

Again, in quotation 7th occurs the following passage: 'Under the government of Judges they continued for *more than* 500 *years*, after the death of Moses and of Joshua their commander.' Josephus is here reviewing the different forms of government under which the nation had subsisted since their Exodus from Egypt, and assigning the duration of their respective periods. He distinguishes only two forms, the *Judicial* and the *Regal*. Under the first he therefore includes the administrations of Moses and Joshua, and hence the significance of the phrase 'under this form they *continued* after their death.' We must therefore deduct from the close of the 592 years the reign of Saul 20 years (see quotation 6th), the reign of David 40, and 3 years of the reign of Solomon, in all 63, which will leave 529 years for the interval in question, that is, 29 years *more than* the round and defective number 500.

The same proof is borne out by another number in the 3rd quotation. 'The ten tribes were removed out of Judea 800 years after Joshua had been their leader.' We must here first of all deduct the administrations of Moses and Joshua (65 years according to Josephus) from the period 592, which will leave 527 years from the death of Joshua to the foundation of the temple. To this we must now add the remaining 37 years of the reign of Solomon and 240 years from the death of Solomon to the captivity of the ten tribes (quotation 3rd), and the result will be 804 years. The term 800 would therefore seem to have been either used indefinitely, or the 4 years thus discovered have dropped by accident from it. If, with Eusebius and Theophilus of

Digitized by Google

of Antioch, we give 27 years to the ministry of Joshua, instead of 25 with Josephus, the term is 802[b] years.

Assuming now, as we think we have sufficient reason to do, that 592 years is the original and intact Josephean calculation of the much-disputed period between the Exodus and the foundation of the temple by Solomon, we proceed with it to verify a statement occurring in quotation 2nd. 'Solomon began to build the temple 1020 years from Abraham's coming out of Mesopotamia into Canaan.' This period is composed of two terms, the 430 years between the Call of Abraham and the Exodus, and the 592 years from that to the building of the temple; and we find that when these are added together, we have exactly 1022 years[c] as the correct interval.

Ascending a step higher in the history, we next meet with the Josephean interval between the Call of Abraham and the flood. The long chronology of this period, as expressed by our author in the ages of the Patriarchs, is 1068 years, but as stated formally is only 367, terms utterly irreconcilable with each other, and bearing the evident impress of corruption. It is still more curious, however, to find that Josephus himself never employs either the one or the other in any subsequent part of the history, but a period very considerably different from both, namely, 428 years. This sum, though not separately mentioned, enters into all the calculations which embrace this period, and seems to have been arrived at in the following way:—Abraham was born in the

---

[b] It may not be out of place to notice here the close agreement of these calculations with the 450 years assigned by Paul to the interval between the death of Joshua and the time of Samuel (Acts xiii. 18): 'About the time of forty years suffered he their manners in the wilderness'—this is the administration of Moses. 'And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot'—this embraces the whole rule of Joshua, as the following statement shows: 'And after that he gave them judges *about* the space of 450 years, until Samuel the prophet.' This includes the whole space between Joshua and Samuel, whose ministry was so much interwoven with the reign of Saul, that it is by Paul included in it in the next part of the verse. Now when from 592 years we subtract the times of Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Saul, David, and Solomon, as given by Josephus, we have the period sought, thus:—

		592
Moses 40, Joshua 25, Samuel 12	= 77	140
Saul 20, David 40, Solomon 3	= 63	
		452

This number is sufficiently exact to answer the case; for Paul only says, 'about the space of 450 years,' not 450 years exactly. But if with Theophilus and Eusebius again we estimate the ministry of Josephus at 27 years instead of 25, as perhaps we should, the number becomes perfectly exact.

[c] 1022 is the computation of Schotanus (*Bibl. Hist.*, tom. ii. p. 779).

Digitized by Google

131st[d] year of his father Terah's life—not in the 70th, as has been inconsiderately supposed—and was therefore 74 years of age at his father's death. He consequently received the Call to leave Mesopotamia in the following year, when he was 75 years old. This mode of calculation therefore adds 61 years more to the short chronological period 367, which thereby becomes 428 years, as the following account will show:—

	Years.
From the flood to the birth of Terah . .	222
From that to the birth of Abraham . . .	131
From that to the Call of Abraham . . .	75
	428

Having ascertained this number we proceed to employ it in rectifying the two following slightly injured terms. In quotation 2nd Josephus says: 'Solomon began to build the temple 1440 years after the deluge.' This interval embraces the three great periods we have examined—

	Years.
From the Deluge to the Call of Abraham . .	428
From that to the Exodus	430
From that to the Temple	592
	1450

The term thus found is 10 years more than the one given, which should be so far rectified; for the error is one which in the course of transcription might easily occur without any design. The one that follows is somewhat similar.

In the same quotation it is added, 'from Adam, the first man who was created, until Solomon built the temple, there had passed in all 3102 years.' This includes the period between the creation of the world and the flood, which we invariably find estimated at 1656 years, according to the shorter computation. Hence—

	Years.
From Adam to the Deluge	1656
From that to the Temple	1450
	3106

A slight correction of only 4 years is here effected, which the present number has evidently lost; so that we have no doubt 3106 is the original number of Josephus.

Having thus revised all those dates which embrace intervals lying between the creation of the world and the erection of the

[d] Since Archbishop Usher first proposed to date the birth of Abraham in the 130th year of Terah, he has been generally followed; but it has not been recognised that Josephus had long preceded him in the discovery.

temple

Digitized by Google

temple by Solomon, the way is prepared for our entering upon the succeeding epoch, in which, as we have said, the chief erratum in the chronology of Josephus lies. In the 4th quotation it is stated that 'the temple was burned 470½ years after it was built.' This extraordinary sum far exceeds every calculation that has yet been proposed for this period. Dr. Hales, who shoots far ahead of all others in his desire to exhibit a lengthened scheme of chronology, gives no more than 441 years as the utmost that can be made of it. The more moderate views of Scaliger, Volney, and Jackson reach no higher than 428 years, while the ordinary calculations of Usher, Petavius, Jahn, Calmet, and Playfair give only 424 years, or 46½ years less than the number under review.

Our own calculation of the duration of the kingdom of Judah after its disruption under Rehoboam, as given in a former article, was 370½ years. That this was the estimate also of Josephus was shown by two quotations, the first giving 240 years as the interval between the death of Solomon and the captivity of the ten tribes, the second, 130½ between the captivity of Israel and that of Judah, and both amounting to exactly 370½ years. If now to this we add the 37 years between the founding of the temple and the death of Solomon, when the revolt of the ten tribes took place, we have exactly 407½ years between the erection and the demolition of the temple. A single glance at the two sums 470½ and 407½ will, we think, reveal to the dullest eye the undoubted source of that error which has occasioned the greatest portion of the disorder and discrepancy so much deplored in this valuable history. We have not a doubt that through some extraordinary inadvertence some careless copyist, misled by their similarity, has written ἑβδομήκοντα for ἑπτά, 470½ instead of 407½, and thus by one sweep of the pen has added 63 years to the period before us. It is quite easy to see how this error could arise, as there was nothing more simple and natural than the mistake; but the error has not ended here, else it might as easily have been remedied. We find the same excess entering into the composition of other periods and occasioning increasing difficulty by its systematic reappearance. There is no other way of accounting for this than by supposing that some future copyist and critic, finding the enlarged number of 470½ in the copy which he used given in such decided terms as the exact extent of the templar period, assumed it therefore to be correct, and set himself carefully to alter and adjust all the dates which should contain it, so as to make them consistent with this calculation. That this is a very probable explanation is evident from the fact that the two dates 240 and 130½, which compose this period, remain uncorrupted, simply because in their separate state the 63

 years

Digitized by Google

years of excess could not be added to them. It is still more remarkably evident from the fact that two other sums including this period have somehow escaped the rude hand of the ignorant emendator to testify against him.

The first of these is given in the 4th quotation—'the temple was burned after the generation of Adam 3513½ years.' This sum is most correctly composed of the following items already verified:—

	Years.
From the Creation to the flood . . .	1656
From that to the Call of Abraham . .	428
From that to the Exodus	430
From that to the Temple	592
Templar period	407½
	3513½

The above analysis presents one of the most valuable and satisfactory proofs we could have desired of the soundness of those conclusions to which we have been conducted, both in reference to our views of the templar period and our other emendations of Josephus. In no other way could this period of 3513½ have originally been composed. The same items we have here before us must have been before Josephus, and consequently must have entered, as far as required, into his other calculations. While it therefore establishes all the previous steps of our present investigation with extraordinary accuracy, it especially vindicates the integrity of 407½ years as the whole time, according to our author, during which the temple of Solomon stood. This important fact is however further exemplified, as we said, in another instance, in which the same epochs are again employed. In the 4th quotation occurs the following statement: 'from the deluge to the destruction of the temple the whole interval was 1957½ years.' This term may be analysed in the following way:—

	Years.
From the Deluge to the Call of Abraham .	428
From that to the Exodus from Egypt . .	430
From that to the erection of the Temple . .	592
From that to its destruction	407½
	1857½*

In comparing this analysis with the preceding, it is plain that a slight error has found its way here into the present copies of Josephus, the figure 8 having been carelessly written 9; but it is easily attributable to the casualty to which figures are so liable. When this amendment therefore is made, we find again that 407½ years

* Schotanus would read 1859 years (*Bibl. Hist. S.*, tom. ii.).

Digitized by Google

years was the original term which our author used for the templar period. Our position is thus confirmed by the repeated evidence of Josephus himself, that the number 470½ is altogether spurious; that it has been most incorrectly but inadvertently substituted for the authentic number 407½; and that the 63 years by which it exceeds the truth have been afterwards most unwarrantably and ignorantly added to a number of dates which we now proceed to rectify.

In quotation 4th it is said, 'when the temple was burnt it was then 1062½ years from the departure out of Egypt.' This term, when freed of the 63 years of excess, becomes more accurately 999½, according to the following data:—

	Years.
From the Exodus to the Temple erection .	592
From that to its destruction	407½
	999½

In the 6th quotation we find that 'the kings of David's race, in number 21, reigned altogether 514½ years.' This interval extends, of course, over the templar period, and contains, it will be found, the superfluous 63 years. When this is therefore removed the genuine period is found to be about 451½ years. We say *about*, for by some accident the term has still one year too many, as the following data will exhibit:—

	Years.
David and Solomon 40 + 3 = . . .	43
Templar period	407½
	450½

Again, in quotation 7th we are informed that 'before their captivity they had kingly government from Saul and David 532½ years.' This sum should exceed the former by the 20 years which Josephus assigns to the reign of Saul—for this includes the whole period of regal rule—and should consequently amount correctly to 470½ years: when, however, the 63 years of error are removed the result is only 469½, a single year having here been somehow lost, whereas in the former instance one had been gained; as if the same cause, we know not how, had operated in producing both errors.

There remain only two dates preceding the destruction of the temple to be analysed, the corrupt state of which we confess ourselves unable to explain. From those already ascertained it is easy enough to say what these ought to be, and must originally have been; but how they came to wear their present anomalous appearance we cannot even conjecture. The first is contained in quotation

Digitized by Google

quotation 3rd. 'So the ten tribes of the Israelites were removed out of Judea 947 years after their forefathers came out of the land of Egypt.' As this term does not extend over the whole templar period, it cannot, we would think, have had the 63 years added to it. It has much more however than that, for it exceeds the duration of the period which it measures by 78 years, an error which can be found in no other number that Josephus has given. The real length of the period intended is only 869 years: thus—

	Years.
From the Exode to the Temple . . .	592
Remainder of Solomon's reign . . .	37
Kingdom of Israel stood	240
	869

The term 947 would carry us back to the 3rd year of Moses' life, which is of no historical importance, or forward to the first year of Josiah's reign, with which the kingdom of Israel had nothing to do. We therefore regard this term as utterly corrupt and valueless.

The second, of a similar character with the preceding, is found in quotation 10th. 'David the king ejected the Canaanites (from Jerusalem) and settled his own people therein; but it was demolished entirely by the Babylonians 477 years and 6 months *after him*.' The first question here is, what is the meaning of the phrase '*after him?*' If we suppose that this period dates from the taking of Jerusalem by David, that is exactly, according to our corrected account, 444½ years before the taking of the city by the Babylonians, which is 33, not 63, years less than the calculation given. But if it dates from the death of David, which is not probable from the terms of the expression, that was 410½ years before the desolation of the city by the Chaldeans, 67 years less than the number given. Which of these references is intended, or whether any of them, it is not easy to say nor important to decide. Yet this is, singular to say, one of the Josephean dates upon which Dr. Hales has founded his views of the templar period; and another of his authorities, which we shall indicate by and by, is no less worthless. It is easy to conceive what errors the system of that distinguished chronologist must contain when his fundamental data are so fallacious.

We have now a few dates to examine, which, with one exception, descend to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and show us the estimate our learned author had formed of this very important period of history.

Before analysing these, however, it is necessary to attend here to

Digitized by Google

to the interval assigned by him to the Babylonian Captivity. He alludes to this period repeatedly as of 70 years' duration, but evidently in the loose and popular sense in which it used to be spoken of by the Jews, from the prophetical time that commenced with the 4th year of Jehoiakim, when the first deportation of captives to Babylon occurred, and ended in the 1st year of Cyrus, when the first company of exiles returned. In quotation 8th, however, we find that Josephus was no stranger to the actual period of desolation, which he there expressly says was 50 years, and proves the same from both the Phœnician and Chaldean records. If, accordingly, we reckon from the year following the taking of Jerusalem, omitting the 6 months that remained of the previous year, to the beginning of the first of Cyrus, the interval is exactly 50 years; for of this Nebuchadnezzar reigned 24 years, Evil Merodach 2, Neriglissor 4, Laborosoarchod 1, Nabonedius, or Belshazzar, 17, and Cyaxares, or Darius the Mede, 2—in all 50 years. But if we include the 6 months of the year preceding this period, and 6 months of the first year of Cyrus, when the exiles first reached their own land again, the whole period of their absence, during which the country lay waste and uninhabited, was 51 years; and as we have hitherto reckoned the templar period to end at the former date, we shall still adhere to this exact mode of calculation, consistent with the twofold year[f] of the Hebrews, finding that it aids considerably in elucidating the chronology and establishing the accuracy of our author.

In quotation 9th we learn that the number of years that passed from the temple's foundation by king Solomon, till its destruction in the 2nd year of Vespasian, is computed to be 1130 years 7 months and 15 days. Deducting from this sum the usual 63 years of excess, we obtain the original Josephean interval of 1067 years 7 months 15 days, which when analysed presents the following results:—

	Years.
Templar period	407 6m.
Actual captivity	51
From 1st Cyrus to 2nd Vespasian . .	609 1m. 15d.
	1067 7m. 15d.

We have here a very remarkable analysis elicited, and we beg

[f] The ecclesiastical year, which commenced with the month Nisan, about the vernal equinox, is that according to which the Scripture history usually calculates; but the mind of a Jew, such as Josephus, accustomed to the use of the civil year also, which commenced about the autumnal equinox, could as easily adapt its thoughts to the one period as to the other.

the

Digitized by Google

the curious reader's attention to it. It singularly and most felicitously accounts for a term which Josephus employs in the same quotation, but which has unhappily been exceedingly vitiated. The statement to which we refer is as follows: 'from the 2nd building of the temple, which was done by Haggai in the 2nd year of Cyrus, till its destruction under Vespasian, was 639 years and 45 days.' By some strange misfortune, for there is no other way of accounting for it, this important number has been written 639 instead of 609 as in our analysis, and the error of 30 years thus produced has been afterwards extended, as we find, to other numbers by some very ignorant emendator. That this has been the case is still more apparent from the 45 days attached to it, which present a singular proof of the minute chronological accuracy of the Jewish historian. We have already shown that as the 407½ years of the temple end in the middle of a year, so the 51 years of the captivity must begin and end in the same manner. The term 609 therefore, commencing at the point where the 51 years end, begins also and ends in the middle of a year; and consequently the 45 additional days exactly make out the 7 months and 15 days of this period. A result such as this, depending upon circumstances so minute, and brought out in a manner so casual, clearly confirms the views we have taken, and enables us now to dispose more easily of the terms that remain.

There is a term in quotation 10th that seems to have sustained more injury than any we have yet undertaken to resolve; but when we have succeeded in detecting the rationale of the corruption, our way is at once clear to the restoration of the original. It is this—'from king David, the first of the Jews who reigned in Jerusalem, to the destruction of it under Titus, there were 1179 years.' This term seems to be composed of the following vitiated dates, which have been substituted by some blundering critic for the true account of Josephus:—

	Years.
Corrupt templar period	470½
,, captivity	70
,, to Vespasian, 2nd	639
	1179½

If this be the correct solution of this number, then it appears that every item of it is erroneous. It has been even unfortunate in the very definition of it, for it does not begin either with the reign of David or the year of his occupation of Jerusalem, but the erection of the temple by Solomon, which was not the idea of the author. If we try another mode of solution on the supposition that all the terms are correct, except the 470½ years of the templar

Digitized by Google

plar period, which are systematically wrong, we are carried back to 6 years before the accession of David to sovereignty, which a strong imagination may perhaps consider his anointing by Samuel. This, however, we cannot admit to have been the idea of Josephus, who seems rather to intend the taking of Jerusalem by David, in order to show the whole time it had been the capital of Judea. With the usual corruption of the templar period, this would be 1167½ years, but, when purified, only 1104½.

There are still two terms which we have purposely kept to the close of these investigations, because we consider them neither certain nor important. We refer to the dates in quotation 10th of the first building of Jerusalem by the mysterious personage Melchizedek. Even Josephus, if they are his, must have adopted them in the credulous spirit of the age, and can only refer to the probable time of his interview with Abraham.

The first of these dates asserts that, 'the king of Babylon took the city of Jerusalem, and made it desolate 1468½ years after it was built by Melchizedek.' Supposing, then, what is most probable, that this sum contains the superfluous 63 years, the composition of it will unfold the following periods:—

	Years.
From Melchizedek to the Exodus . . .	406
From the Exode to the temple	592
The templar period	470½
In all . .	1468½

From this, however, the 63 years must be extracted, and then we realize the true period 1405½ years. It will be seen that this makes the year of Melchizedek given coincident with the 25th year of Abraham's sojourning in Canaan, the year in which Isaac was born. This was the 100th year of Abraham's life, while it would appear from the narrative that the meeting of Abraham with Melchizedek had taken place before his 85th year (Gen. xvi. 3-16). But if the 63 years of excess have not been added to the term, then we are carried 63 years higher in the history, and must date the supposed founding of Jerusalem 39 years before the Call of Abraham.

The other term conveys us from the same hypothetical date down to the final ruin of Jerusalem, 'from its first building to its last destruction were 2177 years.' This term has been also grievously corrupted by additions from other vitiated sources, and by a manifest ignorance of Bible Chronology. The same hand has been employed upon it evidently that so rudely marred the term 1179, as the following enumeration shows:—

From

Digitized by Google

	Years.
From Melchizedek to burning of temple . .	1468½
The period of captivity	70
To the final destruction of Jerusalem . .	639
	2177½

All these three periods are vicious: the first by the excess of 63 years (and its own uncertainty); the second by substituting 70 for 51; the third by 30 years of error; in all 112 years, which being deducted leave us 2065½ years as the probable Josephean account of this interval. Will it, however, be credited that this number, with another already alluded to, both grossly vitiated, and this one at least exceedingly fanciful, are the '*cardinal* dates which form the *hinges*, as it were, upon which the whole chronological system of Dr. Hales turns?'[6] It may hence be evident what the results of such a system must be.

We close this branch of our inquiry, which we have denominated the Civil Chronology of Josephus, by the following brief abstract of its results:—

	Years.	Mths.	Days.
From the Creation to the deluge . . .	1656		
From that to the Call of Abraham . .	428		
From that to the Exodus from Egypt . .	430		
From that to the erection of the temple .	592		
From that to the Captivity	407	6	
From that to the Return	51		
From that to the 2nd year of Vespasian .	609	1	15
From the Creation to 2nd Vespasian . .	4173	7	15

Besides the Civil Chronology above examined, Josephus has also furnished us with a very full series of dates in connection with the priesthood in the 20th book of the Antiquities, and 10th chapter. Before proceeding to scrutinize them, we shall here, as in the former case, place them before the reader.

1. 'The number of all the high priests from Aaron, the first of them, until Phanas (Phinehas), who was made high priest by the seditious (during the last siege of Jerusalem), was 83; of whom, 13 officiated as such in the wilderness from the days of Moses, while the tabernacle was standing, until the people came into Judea, when king Solomon erected the temple to God.'

2. 'The number of years during the rule of these 13 high priests, from the day when our forefathers departed out of Egypt under Moses their leader, until the building of that temple which king Solomon erected at Jerusalem, was 612.'

[6] Hales' *Chron.*, vol. i. p. 297.

3. 'After

Digitized by Google

3. 'After these, 18 others took the high priesthood at Jerusalem in succession, from the days of king Solomon, until Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, burnt the temple, and removed our nation unto Babylon, taking Josadek, the high priest, captive—the times of these high priests were 466 years, 6 months, and 10 days.'

4. 'But after the term of 70 years captivity under the Babylonians, Cyrus, king of Persia, sent the Jews from Babylon to their own land again, and gave them leave to rebuild their temple, at which time Jesus (Jeshua), the son of Josadek, took the high priesthood over the captives when they were returned home. Now he and his posterity, who were in all 15, were under a democratical government for 414 years, until Antiochus Eupator deprived Onias (who was also called Menelaus) of the high priesthood, and conferred it upon Jacimus, who was indeed of the stock of Aaron, but not of the family of Onias.'

5. (*Antt.* XII. vii. 8.) 'The city was taken, and the temple made desolate by Antiochus (Epiphanes), and so continued 3 years. This desolation happened in the 145th year (of the Greek or Seleucidean Era), on the 25th day of the month Apelleus, and on the 143rd Olympiad. But it was dedicated anew on the same day, the 25th of the month Apelleus, in the 148th year, and on the 154th Olympiad. And this desolation came to pass according to the prophecy of Daniel, which was given 408 years before.'

6. (*Antt.* XIII. xi. 1. *Wars*, I. iii. 1.) 'After the death of John Hyrcanus, his eldest son, Aristobulus, intending to change the government into a kingdom, for the first time put a diadem on his head 481 (471) years and 3 months after our people came down into this country, when they were set free from Babylonian slavery.'

7. In this period, which is styled the Asmonean, because, with the exception of the first 3 years when Jacimus was high priest, the nation was under the government of the Maccabees, the descendants of Asmoneus, Josephus gives *seriatim* an account of 9 priesthoods, the sum of whose years amounts to 126, or more correctly 125½. Antigonus, the last of them, was slain by Antony, after Herod took Jerusalem by storm. 'This capture of the city befel it in the 185th Olympiad, in the 3rd month, on the solemnity of the fast, on the same day, 27 years after it had been taken by Pompey. And thus did the government of the Asmoneans cease 126 years after it had been first set up.' (*Antt.* XIV. xvi. 4.)

8. 'Herod was then made king by the Romans, but did no longer appoint high priests out of the family of the Asmoneans, but made certain men to be so that were of no eminent families, but merely of those that were priests. . . . . Accordingly, the number of the high priests from the days of Herod, until the day when Titus took the temple and the city and burned them, were in all 28: the time also that belonged to them was 107 years.'

It is most surprising that this remarkable series of dates has been hitherto, so far as we are aware, entirely overlooked, or looked at only to be treated with disrespect, as at irreconcileable variance

Digitized by Google

variance with the chronology of Josephus. This mistaken view has arisen from two causes; the not observing that the dates were purely of an ecclesiastical character, and the very incorrect manner in which Josephus himself has described them. Indeed, the latter may be considered the only cause, for had the historian stated the case as precisely as the subject required and admitted, the former circumstance could not fail to have struck the attention of the student. When viewed in their proper light, so far are they, however, from being discordant with the dates of the civil series, that they form one of the most decided evidences of their integrity and truth, while they establish in the most felicitous manner the facts we have elicited. As a record of the times of the priesthood, and not of the affairs of the nation, they must be treated entirely *per se*, and not confounded, as they hitherto have been, with those we have just considered. The line they follow diverges, as we have said, from the other at the Exodus, when Aaron was appointed high priest, and coincides again only at the closing catastrophe, where both the Civil and Sacerdotal histories of the Jews terminate together. Keeping this idea distinctly in view, we shall find as we advance in the analysis, that the remarkable concord obtaining between these two historic lines illustrates the harmony that originally reigned in this history.

We begin by observing that Josephus has divided the history of the priesthood into 5 great epochs, for greater ease and perspicuity in handling the subject, as well as on account of the different political periods with which they severally stand connected. The first period extends from Aaron to Zadok inclusively, during which time the form of civil government was chiefly an aristocracy; the second, from Ahimaaz to Josadek inclusively, during which the form of government was regal; the third, from Jeshua to Onias inclusively, during which they were under a democracy; the fourth, from Jacimus to Antigonus inclusively, when they were under a hierarchy; and the fifth, from the beginning of Herod's reign to the final overthrow of the Jewish nation, when they were under Roman governors. The time embraced by these periods amounts exactly, as we shall now show, to the very same number of years exhibited in the civil department.

The 2nd quotation mentions 13 high priests during 612 years, extending from Aaron to the erection of the temple. This has been regarded as utterly at variance with the author's previous assertion (*Antt.* VIII. iii. 1) that this period consisted of 592 years, and the most of chronologists have therefore rejected it as altogether fallacious; while others, such as Theophilus of Antioch, have accepted it as the more genuine account, and treated the

Digitized by Google

the latter term as spurious: Dr. Hales is dissatisfied with both, in his desire to establish a longer calculation. But it has been by all parties overlooked that these two numbers are assigned by Josephus to periods of time entirely distinct from each other, yet each true in its own place. The one (592) terminates in the grand civil era, the founding of the temple by Solomon in the beginning of the fourth year of his reign, and the other (612) ends with the *priesthood* of him who held that sacred office at the time the temple was reared. Zadok was the priest who first officiated in the temple after it was dedicated (1 Kings ii. 35; 1 Chron. xxix. 22). During a considerable portion of the reign of Saul, indeed ever since the massacre at Nob of Ahimelech and his fellow-priests of the line of Ithamar, Zadok, of the line of Eleazar, had probably filled this distinguished office. Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech, having fled to David in the wilderness, was received by him with great kindness, and when David afterwards became king was advanced to the same rank. Thus during the long reign of David there were two high priests who each officiated in a separate sphere—Abiathar with the ark at Jerusalem, and Zadok with the tabernacle at Gibeon (1 Chron. xv. 11; xvi. 39). But when Solomon succeeded to the throne Abiathar was immediately deposed for his treason, while Zadok continued to fill the office he so well discharged alone. The 612 years do not therefore end at the beginning of his pontificate, which may have been above 40 years before the founding of the temple, nor at his attainment of sole authority, when Solomon reigned, nor even at the erection of the temple itself, but at his decease 20 years after the temple was founded and 13 after it was dedicated, a date not to be found in the Bible, but which Josephus, with the genealogical rolls and ages of the priesthood before him, had doubtless the means of accurately ascertaining. The 612 years, then, being 20 years beyond the era of the temple, evidently conduct us to the 23rd year of the reign of Solomon, when Zadok, the high priest at the building of the temple, died and left the office to Ahimaaz his son.

The 3rd quotation exhibits a succession of 18 high priests after the death of Zadok, the last of whom was Josadek, who was carried into captivity, and embraces a period of 466½ years. That Josadek is included in this series is clear from the phraseology of Josephus in the quotation referred to, as well as from the fact that Jeshua, his son, commences the succeeding list. These 466½ years extend, of course, over the templar period, and consequently require to be freed of the 63 interpolated years by which the most of such terms have been vitiated. With this correction

Digitized by Google

correction we would further propose an abatement from this term of 2½ years, by which we find the sacerdotal line exceeds the civil.[h] From no other term but this can such a deduction be made, as the others are too well authenticated to be suspected of containing any redundancy. The previous term of 612 years is mentioned twice in the history; the one that follows this occurs in a manner three times, and the rest fall within the range of authentic history so as to be thereby authenticated also. The present term is, so to speak, a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, and as it already contains an error of 63 years, it is the only one we can suspect of the slight redundancy we have claimed. Removing therefore this small surplus, we have 401 years given as the interval from the death of Zadok to that of Josadek; and when we compare this with the civil list of dates, we find that it carries us down 13½ years beyond the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

Sacerdotal.	Civil.
612	592
401	407½
1013	999½

Thirteen years and a half therefore after the temple was destroyed and the two tribes led captive terminated the life and pontificate of Josadek, an event which, in the view of the historian, formed a line of separation between the priests of the first temple and those of the second.

In looking over the list of quotations from Josephus given above, it will be observed that the captivity is only alluded to in the usual prophetical and popular style, and not in the strictly accurate form in which it would have been noticed had it been regarded as a link in the line of events. It does not in fact appear as an interval at all in this series of dates; for during the long season of exile the sacerdotal succession was not suspended, but transmitted as duly from father to son as if its duties were still in full operation. Where the second ecclesiastical period therefore ends, 13½ years after the sack of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, the third commences, without any regard to that period of national calamity which figures so prominently in the civil history.

Jeshua, if it was indeed he who succeeded to Josadek in the priesthood, must have been but a very young man when his father

[h] This is the only arbitrary change we have proposed in all these calculations; the other alterations made have always been at the instance of clearly established chronological terms. We are, moreover, justified somewhat in the small deduction demanded by finding that it has the 6 months and 10 days of the destruction of the temple attached to it, showing that it has received an increment.

died;

Digitized by Google

died; for according to the Seder Olam he held the pontificate for 53 years after the return of the Jews from Babylon, and if he had been already in office for 37 years, he must have held it altogether during the long period of 90 years, which is barely credible: but this Jewish chronicle is not much to be trusted. We would be disposed to adopt the opinion of Jahn, did we know on what authority it rested, that Jeshua was not the son, but the grandson of Josadek, as Zerubbabel his associate was of Jehoiachin. Josephus, however, who appears not to have understood this, regarded him as the immediate successor of Josadek, and dates from his accession to office the third great period of the sacerdotal history.

In quotation 4th a succession of 15 high priests is said to conduct the public and religious affairs of the Hebrew nation for the space of 414 years, until Antiochus Eupator, son of Antiochus Epiphanes, transfers the sacred office to a different family.

During this lengthened period the returned Jews were vassals, first of the Persian empire, then of the Egyptian, and lastly of the successors of Seleucus, under whose oppression they were at last driven to open revolt and partially attained their independence. This period, we have seen, commences exactly 13½ years after the destruction of Jerusalem, in the beginning of the 33rd year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar: and as from that to the 1st of Cyrus there were 37 years, it terminates precisely 377 years after that date. Now we know from other historical sources that it was in the year 378 from the 1st year of Cyrus that Antiochus Eupator conferred the priesthood upon Jacimus, and deposed Menelaus, or Onias, who had urged the people to madness by his Grecian innovations. This breach in the sacerdotal succession was naturally felt by Josephus to be a marked era in their history, and therefore he here commences his 4th great period.

There are two other important references that very happily corroborate the view we have here taken, although the relative historical facts of the Syrian empire, which exactly agree with it, require no such confirmation. On a point, however, of such curious chronological interest it is most satisfactory to find that other and unexpected attestations are not wanting to place it beyond dispute.

In quotation 5th Jerusalem is said to have been pillaged and the temple polluted by Antiochus in the 145th year of the Seleucidean era, as was predicted by Daniel 408 years before. Now this calamity occurred, as both the books of Josephus and the Maccabees testify, and the history of Antiochus Epiphanes himself shows, exactly 6 years before the coming of Eupator into Judea,

Digitized by Google

Judea, when he deposed Onias and installed Jacimus. But 408 is just 6 years less than 414, so that the two terms are evidently synchronous in their origin, and it appears that Josephus dated the prediction of Daniel in the same year that Jeshua attained the high priesthood.

The other reference, contained in quotation 6th, informs us that Aristobulus, the elder son of Hyrcanus, assumed the diadem in connection with the priesthood 471 years and 3 months after the return from Babylon. However accurately Josephus speaks of civil events in connection with his civil chronology, it must be confessed he speaks of them very loosely in connection with the sacerdotal. His idea, however, seems to have been that as there was no important political event necessarily occurring at his sacerdotal epochs, he might in a popular way connect these epochs with the nearest political event of importance with which they were associated, and leave his figures to indicate how near or remote that connection was. He supposed that, as dealing with ecclesiastical epochs, he would not be misunderstood, though he referred them for greater ease to the great civil epochs of the time. Now the great event of Jeshua's ministry was the restoration from captivity, and to this political era he always refers, while at the same time it is the ecclesiastical date 37 years before it that he has in view. Apply this rule to the case in hand. Aristobulus' reign of one year took place exactly 57 years and 3 months after the deposition of Onias, and the commencement of what is called the Asmonean period. But 57 years 3 months added to 414 make just 471[1] years and 3 months, the period given by Josephus; so that in this case also we are carried back to the same epoch, of which therefore as a Josephean date there can be no doubt.

In quotation 7th the historian has furnished us with a succinct detail of the composition of the next great period, called the Asmonean, in which we find the priestly family of the Maccabees, as they were called, in the ascendant as the patriotic deliverers of their country. Antiochus Eupator having broken the line of the priesthood and banished the next lineal successor from the country, gave the office, as we have said, to Jacimus, a most unworthy person, whom the people would not recognize. He held the pontificate for three years. At the time of his decease, and for a considerable time before, the family of the Maccabees were rapidly rising into renown by their heroic efforts to recover the independence of the Jewish nation. Being of the priestly stock,

[1] In *Wars*, I. iii. 1, this sum has been erroneously written 481 by a slight *lapsus pennæ*, which just exhibits an instance of the careless way in which our author's dates have been transcribed.

and

Digitized by Google

and of the course of Joiarib, the vacant pontificate was soon after conferred upon them, and continued in their family for 122½ years. The whole of the period therefore under review, from the accession of Jacimus, at which time it commenced, to the death of Antigonus and the taking of Jerusalem by Herod, was 125½ years. This accordingly carries us down 502 years from the return of the Jews out of Babylon, and 539½ from the death of Josadek.

The 5th and last period in the history of the priesthood extends, according to the 8th quotation, from the first year of the reign of Herod the Great to the end of the Jewish polity in the second year of Vespasian, and includes the space of 107 years. At the beginning of his reign Herod placed the priesthood upon an entirely new footing. In all past times this sacred office had been regularly transmitted, as far as circumstances would allow, from father to son, and always enjoyed for life. But this jealous and unhappy monarch, who could suffer no rival nor even seeming equal near him, lest they might endanger his precarious power, removed out of his way all the members of the Asmonean family and raised up men to the pontificate of the very lowest order of the priesthood, who thus became his obedient instruments. The same rule continued afterwards to be observed by the Romans, so that during this 107 years there were 28 high priests in office, until, at the destruction of the city and temple, the office, with all its ancient associations, perished for ever.

Having now brought this curious and interesting series of dates to a close, we shall, as in the former case, present them in a tabular form before the reader, and leave him to judge whether we have not successfully attained the object we proposed—a clear and complete adjustment of the chronology of this learned and venerable historian.

Sacred Series.

	Years.
From Aaron to Zadok inclusive . . .	612
From Ahimaaz to Josadek ditto . . .	401
From Jeshua to Onias ditto	414
From Jacimus to Antigonus ditto . . .	125½
From Herod to 2nd Vespasian ditto . . .	107
	1659½

Compared with Civil Series.

From the Exode to the Temple . . .	592
Templar period	407½
Captivity	51
To 2nd Vespasian	609
	1659½

Digitized by Google

ON THE SEPARATE STATE.

Had we no express declaration in the New Testament of the happy condition of the souls of the righteous in the interval betwixt death and resurrection, it might nevertheless have been inferred from the broad and general consideration of their standing. They who in the present world have been quickened together with Christ (Eph. ii. 5); who in respect of sin, and of all partaining to the old creation, are dead; and who, as new creatures, possess a life that is hid with Christ in God (Col. iii. 3),—might well be relieved of all apprehensions relative to the intermediate state of departed spirits. For it would seem incredible, *à priori*, either that the functions of their new and divine life should ever be suspended, so that they should pass at death into unconsciousness, or that the change that then takes place should bring them into a position inferior and less desirable than that which they occupied in the body.

It was intended that the hope of the Lord's return should be vividly entertained by each living generation of true believers. They were to wait for the Son of God from heaven (1 Thess. i. 10); and the last words of the last of the inspired writers (with the exception of the closing benediction) reiterate the cheering promise, 'Yea, I come quickly;' to which the ready response is, 'Amen, come, Lord Jesus.' The striking prominence everywhere in the New Testament given to this 'blessed hope' is evidence of its powerfully influential character both for warning and comfort. *Christ's coming to the living* is the ever recurring testimony of the Spirit; whilst the *departure of the soul to Him* is a far less frequent subject of allusion, and one incidentally rather than systematically treated of.

Notwithstanding, however, that present oneness of life with the risen Jesus, and an actual place in the heavenlies in Him (Eph. ii. 6) appear plainly to involve the conscious felicity of the departed spirit; and that the fulness of revelation bears on the resurrection rather than on the separate state; the special comfort is still realized of certain passages which clearly and directly refer to the latter. To bring these together, accompanied by a few remarks and explanations, may not be unacceptable to some of the readers of this Journal.

The first to be considered is Luke xvi. 19-31. It is of little consequence what were the prevailing opinions of the orthodox Jews in our Lord's time on this subject. If they were correct, still they would not be required to corroborate or explain a Divine revelation;

Digitized by Google

revelation; if otherwise, they would be still less worthy of attention. In either case the idea should be discarded that the Lord designedly framed this description so as to harmonize with the popular view of the day. An idea, indeed, that is not admissible when it is a question of the words and teaching of inspired truth, —of that which is perfect and all complete by itself; not framed upon human thoughts, whether Jewish or Gentile, or deriving its colouring from them, but, like its Author, light without any darkness at all.

In explaining a parabolic discourse an interpreter may err, not only by attaching doctrinal value to circumstances that belong merely to its imagery or ornaments, but also by classing with the latter, features that are really important, if not essential. Now in the parable before us there is nothing to forbid the idea that we have a true delineation of the state of the dead under the past dispensation, when, as appears from many passages of the Old Testament, *hades* was the place to which the spirits of the saved and the lost were alike consigned. It appears from this Scripture, 1. That both good and bad pass at once after death into a state of conscious bliss or misery. 2. That angels are employed to carry the former to their appointed locality. 3. That though separated by a wide chasm from the place of torment for the lost, yet the abode of Abraham and his true children was but another compartment of the common hades, which would appear from many Scriptural allusions (as Deut. xxxii. 22; Job xi. 8; Amos ix. 2, &c.) to be in the lower parts of the earth. When the ghost of Samuel announced to Saul, 'to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me' (1 Sam. xxviii. 19), it does not, as Campbell observes,[a] 'imply that their condition would be the same, though each would have his place in the receptacle of departed spirits.' The reader may refer, if he pleases, to the Professor's further remarks on this parable, and on the subject of hades generally, and compare them with the opposite view of Bishop Pearson,[b] that 'there is no certainty that the souls of the just, the patriarchs, and the rest of the people of God, were kept in any place below, which was, or may be, called the hell: the bosom of Abraham (he continues) might well be in the heavens above. . . . the Scriptures nowhere tell us that the spirits of just men went unto or did remain in hell,' &c. Most of the ancient Fathers of the Church, however, he states, believed that the just were rewarded, as well as the unjust punished, ὑπὸ χθονὸς or κατ' ᾅδου; nor does the learned Prelate produce any direct or conclusive argument for the contrary. If *sheol* be taken

[a] Preliminary Dissert. vi. part 2. Ἅιδης and Γεεννα.
[b] On the Creed. Art. V.

Digitized by Google

as a general designation for the receptacle of all the dead, there appears no reason why, for want of a now equivalent English word, the original should not be retained, or else rendered uniformly by hades (as almost everywhere in the LXX.). The context would be a sufficient indication whether a general or special import is to be attached to it. 'Grave' expresses too little, and 'hell' (as now understood) too much. To discuss, however, the arguments for and against this view would be rather beside the object of this paper, in which the present rather than the past state of the dead is considered. A remark or two will only be added. 1. From Ps. xvi. 10 (comp. with Acts ii. 27-31) the natural inference appears to be that for the soul in that dispensation to go to sheol, was as much the lot of man in general, as for the body to see corruption. The words 'soul' and 'sheol' are found together again in the following Psalms, where it would seem but reasonable to attach to both the meaning it is certain they have in Ps. xvi., viz., Ps. xxx. 3, xlix. 15, lxxxvi. 13, lxxxix. 48—'What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul from the hand of Sheol? 2. The word Rephaim (always rendered 'dead' or 'deceased' in our common version) means the shades, or spirits of the departed.

> 'The shades tremble from beneath,
> The waters, and their inhabitants.
> Sheol is naked before him,
> And Destruction hath no covering.'—
> Job xxvi. 5, 6. (*Barnes.*)

That is, 'the whole universe is under the control of God, and trembles before him. Sheol and its shades; the oceans and their inhabitants stand in awe before him.'

In Ps. lxxxviii., which abounds in phraseology connected with death, we read:—

> 'To the dead wilt thou show wonders?
> Shall the rephaim arise (and) praise thee?'—v. 11.

Here, again, the rephaim or shades evidently refer to the dead in general. In Prov. ii. 18 the wicked are specially intended, as also in ch. ix. 18, which also shows that the rephaim dwell in sheol:—

> 'But he knoweth not that the rephaim (are) there;
> (And) in the depths of sheol her guests.'

The same appears from Isa. xiv. 9. The word thus appears to designate generally the spirits of both good and bad, and like 'sheol,' with which it is found associated, as in the above instances, to depend upon the context for the precise line of thought to be connected with it. 3. The expression 'to be gathered to one's

Digitized by Google

one's people,' or 'to one's fathers,' is, as observed by Gesenius (*Heb. Lex.*), 'distinguished both from death and burial' (see Gen. xxv. 8; xxxv. 29; xlix. 29, 33; 2 Kings xxii. 20); and it is used of all persons indiscriminately (Jud. ii. 10). 4. That קֶבֶר *keber*, the common word for sepulchre or grave, occurs no less than seventy times, should be remembered by those who would in many places attach the same signification to שְׁאוֹל *sheol*. Upon the whole, then, it is submitted, that the general tendency of Old Testament phraseology and allusions appears in favour of that view concerning hades, which the parable in Luke xvi. naturally also suggests; and, moreover, that there is on the other hand far less to advance in favour of the view that the spirits of the righteous went to *heaven*.

The ancient belief that their condition is different since the death and resurrection of the Lord to what it was before, will be easily embraced by those who concur in the above conclusion. That the completion of Christ's redemption work should sensibly affect the separate spirits of the saved, is, *à priori*, not an improbable supposition. And without there being, as far as the writer is aware, any passage that directly asserts it, those texts that allude to their present felicity, contrasted with the very different state and locality of the wicked, would lead almost necessarily to such a conclusion.

In Rom. x. 7 the 'abyss' is evidently equivalent to hades; and one obvious inference from that passage is, that Christ rose once and for ever ἐκ νεκρῶν,—from the dead *in general*, from the deep wherein all alike were found.

Phil. ii. 10 relates to a period when the three classes of beings, those in heaven, those on earth, and those under the earth, will all acknowledge the lordship of Jesus. It is not said that this belongs to the present time; nor does it probably relate to the ulterior state, when death and hades will merge, so to speak, into the lake of fire (Rev. xx. 14). 'καταχθόνιοι' is best explained by Theodoret and many eminent *modern* expositors to denote *the souls of the departed* (over whom Jesus Christ is alike Lord: see Rom. xiv. 9).'[c]

Those who recognize an intermediate dispensation to follow the present, and to precede the new heaven and new earth, will have no difficulty in referring this passage to it. The age which will be ushered in by the second coming of the Lord, the resurrection of the faithful dead, and the transformation of the living, will find the church of the first-born in heaven, Israel and other Gentile nations in the flesh in blessing on the earth, and the departed

[c] Bloomfield, Gr. Test.

wicked

Digitized by Google

wicked still awaiting in the depths of hades the period when they shall be summoned before the great white Throne to receive the awful sentence which will consign them to their terrible and final doom.

Rev. v. affords the best illustration of the preceding text. It manifestly relates to the dispensation above alluded to. The glorified church in heaven, represented by the living creatures and the throned elders, sings the praises of redemption (v. 9), and in verse 10 speaks of Israel thus, 'and thou hast made them unto our God a kingdom and priests: and they reign on the earth.'[d] In verse 3 it is said, 'no one in heaven, nor on the earth, neither *under the earth*[e] (ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς), was able,' &c.; and in verse 13, 'and every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and *under the earth*, and on the sea, and all things that are in them, heard I saying; Unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb (be) blessing, and honour, and glory, and dominion, for ever and ever.'

On the much controverted passage, 1 Pet. iii. 18-20, the view taken here is what was long since given by Beza, Bishop Pearson,[f] and others, viz., that Christ by his Spirit preached to the antediluvians by Noah, whose spirits are *now* in prison. Not that the condemned of other ages are not there too; but the Apostle seems specially to allude to the days of Noah, on account of the parallelism betwixt them and the present age, and for the purpose of the typical instruction connected with the ark, and the rite of baptism, which he proceeds to deduce. That is, as the disobedient *then* had their day of grace, and, for despising the long-suffering of God, are now in prison awaiting the final judgment; whilst Noah and his family were saved by water: so the present is also a time of long-suffering to all, and in which true believers are saved by baptism, or, as the Apostle explains, by that which baptism typifies, *the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*

We might almost fancy we had a fragment of Æschylus[g] before us in that striking expression of Peter, σειραῖς ζόφου ταρταρώσας

---

[d] Tregelles's *Book of Revelation from Ancient Authorities.*—BAGSTER.

[e] Many of the old expositors understood Eph. iv. 9, of Hades But τῆς γῆς is better taken with Bloomfield, Pearson, and others, as a genitive of *explanation.* Christ's descent to earth, and his incarnation on earth, terminating with his descent into the grave; is what is signified. 'He also descended into the lower parts, (namely) of the earth.'

[f] Dr. Bloomfield (Gr. Test.), after quoting and approving Bishop Horsley's exposition of this Scripture, cites Bishop Pearson as agreeing with it, which is an error.

[g] Comp. *Prom. Vinct.*, 152-155:—

εἰ γὰρ μ' ὑπὸ γῆν νέρθεν τ' ἀΐδου
τοῦ νεκροδέγμενος εἰς ἀπέραντον
Τάρταρον ἦκεν, δεσμοῖς ἀλύτοις
ἀγρίοις πελάσας,—

παρέδωκεν

Digitized by Google

παρέδωκεν κ. τ. λ., 'having thrust (them) down to Tartarus delivered (them) to chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment.' (2 Pet. ii. 4.) These fallen angels mentioned also by Jude (6), it may be remarked by the way, should not be confounded with Satan and his angels, who are not yet chained in darkness as these are. They are manifestly a particular class by themselves. The legion of demons mentioned in the Gospels, dreaded being sent into the abyss (εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον). (Luke viii. 31.) From the same abyss issue the vast swarm of evil spirits, the mystic locusts, the symbolic description of which is given in Rev. ix., and the beast, the last great enemy of Christ and His people, ascends from the same place (Rev. xi. 7; xvii. 8) in which Satan himself is to be shut up for a thousand years (xx. 3).

Rev. xx. 12-15, carries us to the final consummation. The sea, death, and hades, as it were personified, like three jailors, deliver up their prisoners. All that is conveyed is, that those who have met their death in the sea, and who through death (of whatever kind) have gone to hades,[h] will be re-united to bodies, and be judged. After which, 'death, which consists in the separation of the soul from the body, and the state of souls intervening between death and judgment, shall be no more.' The second death, or the lake of fire, will thenceforth be the everlasting lot of those who have died in their sins and unbelief (xxi. 8), and whose names are not found in the book of life.

After the above rapid glance at the 'under world,' which it is maintained was of old the common abode of all separate spirits, but, since the great work of the Saviour, alone the prison of the wicked, we may turn to the more pleasing part of the subject, the place and state of those who now depart in the saving faith of Jesus. The place we may gather, in the first instance, from Luke xxiii. 43, to be *paradise*. The astonishing faith of the robber who recognized in Him who was crucified at his side, the dignity of the Lord and King of Israel, and said, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom,' was met by the riches of His grace who went even beyond the prayer of the petition and said, 'Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'[i] We could linger with delight upon this most precious illustration of free grace—upon the transcendent virtue of that wondrous Cross by which not merely this poor helpless sinner was saved without

[h] See ch. vi. 8, where *hades* follows close upon *death*. An intimation it would seem that they who thus perish are finally lost.

[i] Those who have proposed to put a comma after σήμερον, do violence to the passage. As Theophylact observes; ἄλλοι δὲ ἐκβιάζονται τὸ ῥῆμα, στίζοντες εἰς τὸ σήμερον, ἵν' ᾖ τὸ λεγόμενον τοιοῦτον, ἀμὴν λέγω σοι σήμερον, εἶτα τὸ μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἐπιφέροντες.

the

Digitized by Google

the co-operation of works or ordinances; which, if out of the question in any instance, were in the uttermost sense impossible in this one; upon the marvellous blending of weakness and power in the Divine Sufferer, who, whilst dying the most ignominious and accursed of all deaths, could extend forgiveness, and open the gates of the kingdom, to one of the worst of mankind; upon the deep malignity and horrible nature of sin, not to be pardoned on any other consideration than the shedding of the blood of the eternal and incarnate Son of God; and upon that inconceivable love in God the Father, who spared not His only begotten Son, but gave Him up, that 'whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' Upon things such as these might we linger, and, familiar as they may be, they should never weary. With relish uncloyed by oft past enjoyment, with admiration unabated by frequency of contemplation, with ardour undiminished by repeated experiences, we should ever dwell on the stupendous theme of a crucified Saviour. A stumbling-block, as of old, unto the self-righteous, and foolishness to the wise of this world, but the power of God, and the wisdom of God, to the called of all nations. But confining ourselves for the present purpose to the Lord's words to the repentant malefactor, we inquire, Was the promise a special one made to him? Was his to be an exception to the general lot of other saved persons, like that of Enoch and Elijah (and perhaps Moses), in the past dispensations? This is possible, but it is more probable that this man's entrance into paradise that day marked the beginning of a new era in respect to the place and state of the saved dead—that what was his lot henceforth became that of all justified persons after death. This view seems both to put greater honour on the Lord's work, and to agree well with the impression received from the other passages that remain to be produced.

Paradise can by no means be identical, as many have thought, with the compartment in hades assigned to the righteous. If it be, as Campbell says, 'another name for what is, in the parable, called Abraham's bosom,' then would the prayer of the robber have been far less wonderfully answered than on the view that he was promised something much beyond the heretofore lot of the departed.

To share with the righteous the bliss of Abraham's bosom would indeed have been a great thing, but the desire of faith that even at such an hour could anticipate the future glories of the kingdom, and recognize the verity of the triple inscription on the cross of Jesus, it is likely would be answered by something more pointed and peculiar than the assurance of a participation in what had ever been the general destiny of all. Nor from the way in which

Digitized by Google

which paradise is subsequently mentioned in the New Testament, can it be supposed to have any connection with hades, and that there is more than *one* paradise is a gratuitous supposition.

The Lord Jesus unquestionably went on the day of his death to hades, or the 'hell' of the Creed. But in respect of His divine nature He was, and always is, every where. We can believe the fact though we cannot explain in what manner the pardoned criminal was on the same day not only in paradise, but there *with Christ.*

Let us pass on to the only two other places where paradise is alluded to.

2 Cor. xii. 1-4.—The third heaven, according to the general and doubtless correct view, is the heaven properly so called—the abode of God and the angels; the other two being the region of the clouds and atmosphere, and the sidereal, or place of the stars. That the Apostle is speaking of two distinct visions, and therefore that paradise and heaven are not strictly the same, is sufficiently evident, as Campbell observes,—1. From the use of the plural 'visions and revelations' (*v.* 1, 7). 2. From the wording of the narrative, the Apostle passing in *v.* 3 to a distinct transaction, introduced by 'and.' 3. From the repetition of his doubts (*v.* 2, 3), which would have been not only superfluous but improper, if he had been speaking only of one event; but necessary on the supposition of two being in question. 4. From the unexampled tautology involved in the relation, if only one revelation be meant. To which he adds 'the opinion of all Christian antiquity, Origen alone excepted,' which, he observes, 'in a question of philology, is not without its weight.' But when the learned Professor goes on to say that in the word ἁρπάζω, there is nothing that answers to 'caught *up*' in our version, but that the word is expressive more of the suddenness of the event, and of his own passiveness, than of the direction of the motion, he seems to overlook that the context quite bears out the common version: ἁρπαγέντα — ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ is surely correctly rendered 'caught *up* to the third heaven,' and ἡρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον coming immediately after, it can scarcely be doubted is rightly given by 'he was caught *up* into paradise.' (Compare 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. xii. 5.) At all events the idea of a *descent* will hardly be suggested by the word in such a connection. It may be conjectured that paradise is a particular region in heaven; and the Apostle's words, 'whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth,' are interesting, as proving (if proof were wanted) that the soul may have perception when out of the body, and, independently of it, enjoy both sights and sounds of happiness. Of the nature of these in the present instance we know nothing, since it was not permitted to the

Digitized by Google

the Apostle to divulge them. They are called ἄῤῥητα ῥήματα, ineffable words.[k]

Rev. ii. 7.—'To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the paradise of God.' This relates, like all the promises to the seven churches, to the resurrection state. It is called the paradise *of God*, as marking its unearthly character, perhaps in contrast with the garden in Eden. What we know then of paradise is,—1. That the soul of the penitent robber was there with Jesus after death (and, by probable inference, the souls of all the saved, as above remarked, are there also). 2. That Paul was taken there alive, but whether in a disembodied state or not is uncertain. 3. That it will be one of the future spheres of bliss to the people of God in the resurrection.

No use is made in this paper of the visions of heaven in the Apocalypse, as it would seem that the redeemed were beheld by John there, not in the separate state, but as they will be after the resurrection. The representation of their final state was pictured to him; and, seeing heaven, he saw in vision the saints anticipatively there too. Only in two places does he make mention of disembodied spirits (in xx. 4); where their locality is not specified the souls of martyrs alone appear to be meant; although, as it has been remarked, by regarding this section of the redeemed as a *representative* body (just as the seven churches *represent* all churches), what is said of them may be understood as true of all Christians.

When the fifth seal was opened (vi. 9-11), John beheld the souls of the martyrs (more particularly perhaps those who died for the truth in the period before mentioned in the chapter) under the altar (*i. e.* the golden altar of incense) in heaven. This altar in the tabernacle was the place of the priestly ministrations of Aaron and his sons. In heaven it is the place of the present intercession of Christ (viii. 3), with whom his people also will hereafter minister, when, in their risen state, they shall enter upon the full functions of their priestly office. The sphere in which these souls were seen was therefore *heaven*, whether the precise spot here indicated at the foot of the altar be understood as their permanent locality whilst disembodied, or whether they may at times be there and at times in paradise. And whatever special distinction may be inferred from this Scripture to belong to the souls of martyrs, it affords of itself a good ground to conclude that those of the righteous generally are at any rate somewhere in heaven. The loud cry of the souls that John saw for divine retribution for

[k] ἄῤῥητα is the opposite of διδακτά, what can be taught. Thus—

ὃ πάντα νωμῶν Τειρεσίᾳ, διδακτά τε
ἄῤῥητα τ'οὐράνιά τε καὶ χθονοστιβῆ.—Soph. *Œdip. Tyr.* 300.

their

Digitized by Google

their blood on those that dwelt on the earth, evidences their dissociation from all merely human sympathies. They only give expression to feelings that are identical with God's thoughts, and in unison with the unbending requirements of his justice and holiness. Their position is one of *rest* and *expectation*, until others of their fellow servants and brethren that are about to be killed, as they had been, shall be completed. The white robe bestowed on each of them has been understood as the symbol of triumph or victory.

The entrance of the redeemed into their final and complete state of happiness is alluded to in Rev. xiv. 13: 'Blessed [are] the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works do follow them.' οἱ ἀποθνήσκοντες means, as it has been observed, 'the dead in an abstract and collective sense, as denoting a whole class.' Each individual believer rests from his labours when he dies; but the whole body of the faithful dead are here spoken of as partaking of their consummated felicity. They are therefore emphatically pronounced blessed *from henceforth*. See the following verse: 'And I saw, and behold a white cloud,' &c.

Stephen seems not only to have been the first martyr, but also the first of the faithful who died since the completion of Christ's work. His dying words evince a clear knowledge of the felicity that awaited him immediately on his departure: 'And they stoned Stephen, calling upon [Jesus], and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!' (Acts viii. 59.) He knew that his spirit would go to the glorified Son of Man whom he had just beheld standing on the right hand of God. Such was his anticipation. And it confirms the inference that was drawn from Luke xxiii., that Paradise is now the place for all who, like the penitent robber and Stephen, fall asleep in the faith of Jesus. Nor can we fail to be struck by the contrast of this cheering prospect with the anticipations of those in previous ages, of whom it is written that, 'through fear of death,' they were 'all their lifetime subject to bondage' (Heb. ii. 15). There is indeed a vast difference between the general belief then entertained, that while the dust returns to the earth as it was, the spirit returns unto God who gave it (Eccles. xii. 7),[m] and the vivid faith, grounded on clear and precise revelations,

[m] With this passage may be compared the other, ch. iii. 21, which with Rosenmüller should be regarded as parenthetical: *q. d.* very few know this. It is a rare knowledge undiscoverable by sense, and imparted alone by divine revelation. As to themselves, and in so far as natural perceptions can judge, 'man hath no pre-eminence above a beast.' Perhaps no stress is to be laid on the words, 'that goeth upward,' as if indicative of *locality*; for as 'that goeth downward,' spoken of the beast must mean simply perishing; so by the opposite may be conveyed the notion

Digitized by Google

revelations, that now sustains the Christian's heart, and disarms death of its chiefest terrors.

2 Cor. v. 1-9 contains a direct allusion to the separate state: 'If the earthly house of our tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God,' etc., *i. e.* a resurrection, and heavenly, and eternal body. Our earnest desire, the Apostle goes on to say, is to be *clothed upon* (ἐπενδύσασθαι) with our house which is from (or, of) heaven: *i. e.*, our *heavenly* house (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 47: 'The second man, the Lord, [is] from heaven,' *i. e.*, heavenly). 'If, indeed, also being clothed,' or, 'although being now clothed' (*i. e.* with a body, though a perishing one), 'we shall not be found naked,' *i. e.* without *a* body; being amongst those alive at the second advent (see 1 Cor. xv. 51[n]). For in respect of the general hope of the Church, those belonging to it could always say, 'We which are alive, [and] remain unto the coming of the Lord' (1 Thess. iv. 15). Our wish, then, is not to get rid of the present burden of our state by being unclothed (or dying), but by being clothed upon, *i. e.*, invested at once without tasting death, with our resurrection body. Yet, though our *main desire* be as above stated, nevertheless we are confident, under any circumstances, since, 'whilst we are present in the body, we are absent from the Lord' (v. 6). Nay, we are even 'willing rather to be absent from the body (*i. e.*, in the separate state), and to be present with the Lord' (v. 8). 'Therefore we are ambitious (φιλοτιμούμεθα) that, whether present or absent, we may be well-pleasing (εὐάρεστοι) to him' (v. 9). For the separate spirit will be conscious of the measure in which, in this life, the person has been approved of God.

The above Scripture thus conveys:—1. The chief and special object of aspiration—life in the resurrection body. 2. A readiness to depart; nay, even a preference of absence from the body, seeing it involves *presence with the Lord*, howbeit our natural feeling is repugnant to being unclothed. Here, then, we have another decisive evidence of the happiness and the place of the disembodied spirit. The life of faith is terminated, and the immediate pre-

---

notion of continued existence and preservation. All the ancient, and many modern interpreters after Luther, render this verse, 'who knoweth the spirit of man *whether* it goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast *whether* it goeth downward,' &c. But although this is perhaps grammatically admissible, the common version deserves the preference: and thus also Aben Ezra and Rosenmüller render.

[n] Professor Scholefield renders this verse 'Since being clothed (with it) literally having put it on,' &c. Similarly Bloomfield, 'Since being so clothed (*i. e.* having put on this dress) we shall not be found naked,' *i. e.* destitute of *a* body (whatever may become of our earthly one). The only objection to this is, that ἐνδύσασθαι is thus made equivalent to ἐπενδύσασθαι. The occurrence of the other verb ἐκδύσασθαι, however, gives the impression that each proposition has a distinct force.

sence

Digitized by Google

sence of the Lord is enjoyed, and it only remains for the resurrection to consummate our bliss.

The next passage that is to be cited is Philip. i. 21-24: 'For to me to live is Christ (*i. e.*, I live only for him and his work. Comp. v. 20), and to die is gain.' But whether this living in the flesh be worth my while (or 'profitable for me,' Beza), or what I shall choose, I know not.[o] But I am in a strait betwixt two (or I am held in suspense between these two), having the desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better. But to abide in the flesh is more needful for your sakes.'

Here the Apostle uses stronger language than in 2 Cor. v. with reference to the superiority of the disembodied state, for it is measured rather by comparison with the ills and disadvantages of the present, than with the perfection of the resurrection life. Release from toil and sorrow, and the desire to be with Christ, have doubtless led many besides himself to wish to depart; while other considerations have reconciled them, as in his instance, to a longer sojourn below. With so little to gratify our curiosity about details, yet the above passages are full of comfort, as furnishing decided proof of the Christian's happiness after death. One other remains to be produced.

1 Thess. iv. 13-18. To *sleep* is a frequent and familiar expression in Scripture, as signifying to die. Believers are spoken of as those who are 'fallen asleep in Christ' (1 Cor. xv. 18). The Lord said, 'our friend Lazarus sleepeth' (John xi. 11.), &c. This figure, when employed with reference to the departure of the child of God, is linked with peculiarly peaceful and tranquillizing associations. Viewed with relation to this world—its activities, its toils, its pains—death is to him but a sweet sleep. To the eye of sense he *falls asleep*: it may be like Stephen, in the agonies of a violent death, or, like Lazarus, on a pillow smoothed down by the tender hands of affectionate relatives; whilst faith, resting on bright and cheering revelations, can follow the happy spirit to regions of bliss, where Jesus is ready to receive it.[p]

The

---

[o] The writer has adopted, though not without some hesitation, Professor Scholefield's rendering of this somewhat embarrassing passage, 'Hints for an improved translation of the New Testament.' Diodati is to the same effect: 'Or io non so se 'l vivere in carne m' è vantaggio, nè ciò ch' io debbo eleggere.' So also Ostervald.

[p] The heathen also spoke of death as sleep; but with what a different association! Witness the beautiful and plaintive lines of Moschus, Idyll. iii.:—

> The meanest herb we trample in the field,
> Or in the garden nurture, when its leaf
> At winter's touch is blasted, and its place
> Forgotten, soon its vernal bud renews,

And

Digitized by Google

The Thessalonians appear to have been in some doubt and anxiety respecting the prospects of their departed brethren: the cause and exact nature of which does not appear. The Apostle tells them that there was no ground for solicitude. They might sorrow, indeed, for them, but with *tempered* sorrow; not as 'others which have *no hope*.' 'For if (i. e., *since*) we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep, through Jesus will God bring with him.' That is, he will raise them up, and bring them along with Him (*i. e.*, Jesus) into heaven (as Dr. Bloomfield explains, and as Ostervald also renders: 'Dieu ramènera par Jésus ceux qui seront morts, afin qu'ils soient avec lui'). He proceeds to say that those living at the second advent 'would not anticipate the dead in being received up into heaven;' that the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God would first awaken the dead in Christ, and then they and the living would be caught up *together*, to meet the Lord in the air. For a brief moment, it might seem, the spectacle will be presented of all the redeemed standing on the earth in glorified bodies, previous to being translated above. It has been already remarked that *the* hope of the faithful is Christ's coming.

It nowhere, perhaps, appears more manifestly than in this passage (see especially v. 17). The Thessalonians are exhorted to 'comfort one another *with these words*;' in the which, however, beyond the repeated mention of 'them which sleep,' and once 'the dead in Christ,' we have less information than may be gleaned from other texts respecting the place and condition of the departed. So real and effectual is the consolation derived from 'that blessed hope,' when realized by the soul in freshness and power.

Allusion to separate spirits is found also in Heb. xii. 23. 'But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels—a general assembly;[q] and to the church of the first-born ones, enrolled in

---

And from short slumber wakes to life again.
Man wakes no more! Man, valiant, glorious, wise,
When death once chills him, sinks in sleep profound,
A long, unconscious, never-ending sleep. GISBORNE.

What a refreshing contrast is presented in the words, 'our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep;' and the mournful, despairing lament,

Ὅπποτε πρῶτα θάνωμες, ἀνάκοοι ἐν χθονὶ κοίλᾳ
Εὕδομες εὐ μάλα μακρὸν ἀτέρμονα νήγρετον ὕπνον.

Job (xiv. 12) says, 'man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, (i. e. *never*; comp. Ps. lxxxix. 36, 37), they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.' Nothing however is here in question about an intermediate state, or the resurrection. The statement simply is, man can never re-appear in *this* state of existence, or spring up as a sprout from a fallen tree. See Barnes's *Comment.*

[q] This pointing, by which πανηγύρει refers to μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, is required, as many have shown, by the structure of the whole portion, and is adopted by the best critics. So Chrysostom, Theophyl. and Peseh. Syr.

heaven,

Digitized by Google

heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and *to the spirits of just men perfected,*' &c. The church of the first-born is so called with relation to the other redeemed ones, converted during the millennial age, after the first resurrection and translation to heaven of the former. The whole context plainly relates to the final or resurrection state; yet *to faith* these things are, so to speak, present. The just are spoken of as *perfected*, which can only be said of them in the consummation of glory and happiness in the resurrection (comp. xi. 40). Their *spirits* are expressly mentioned because the noblest and undying part of them. 'The spirits of the just,' we might gather from this place, must be even now in bliss; but when it is said 'the spirits of the *just perfected*,' we have them presented to us in a higher than a disembodied state.

Some faint support for the notion that the separate spirit bears a certain resemblance to the person living, may perhaps be obtained from certain passages, as Mark vi. 49; Luke xxiv. 37-39; Rev. vi. 9-11, xx. 4; 1 Sam. xxviii. 14; Luke xvi. 23. But they are far from conclusive.

In conclusion, we may observe that nowhere is the association of *glory* attached to the separate state, but rather that of a tranquil rest and enjoyment of Christ's presence, with freedom from all sin and sorrow. The departed just doubtless await with happy anticipation the period for their being clothed with their heavenly house, and enjoy communion with each other as well as with the Lord. Whether they have any knowledge of what is going on in the world cannot either be positively affirmed or denied.

Heb. xii. 1 cannot bear upon this question, for the persons there mentioned may be called 'witnesses,' with reference to God and His truth. Or if there is, according to some, an *agonistic* allusion, and the cloud of witnesses are represented as spectators of the exertions of those whom the Apostle is addressing, this can only be imagery, not reality, for those who look on are represented as *compassing us about* (περιχείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος), as though around us, and not contemplating us from above.

AN

Digitized by Google

AN

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

By KARL F. KEIL, Ph.D., D.D.,

Professor of Exegesis and Oriental Languages in the University of Dorpat.

PART II.

§ III. *The Date of the Book of Joshua.*

THE critics differ, by at least one thousand years, in their views of the time when the book of Joshua was composed. Some date it in the times of the captivity, or even later; others maintain it was written by Joshua himself or one of his contemporaries. See the various opinions collected in Carpzov's *Introd. ad Libros Biblicos*, i. 150 *seq.*, and in König's *Alttest. Studien*, i. 133 *seq.*

I. The opinion of Masius, Spinoza, Le Clerc, and Hasse, that it was composed after the exile, has indeed been again recently advocated by Maurer, but it is now abandoned even by De Wette. According to the newest phase of neological criticism, it was produced along with Deuteronomy, a short time before the exile, either in the days of Josiah,[a] or during the latter half of Manasseh's reign.[b] The grounds for this opinion stand or fall with the hypothesis that our book was originally one with the Pentateuch, which we have disproved in § II. The other reasons alleged are stated very confusedly in the latest edition of De Wette's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament.* The mythological and Levitical spirit of the book and its etymologies[c] can be urged as critical indications of its age only through the blindness arising from perverted doctrine. The same may be said in respect to Joshua's curse against the rebuilding of Jericho, and its fulfilment under Ahab (ch. vi. 26, comp. 1 Kings xvi. 34), which the rationalistic doctrine perverts into a *vaticinium post eventum*, in order to base upon it uncritical conclusions: see my *Comment.* on ch. vi. 26. With much better right have Michaelis (on Josh. vi. 26), Eichhorn,[d] Herbst,[e] Wette,[f] and König[g] concluded that our book must

[a] Lengerke's *Kenaan*, i. cxxv. *seq.*
[b] Ewald's *Geschichte des Volks Israel*, i. 146, 160 *seq.*
[c] Maurer, *Comment.*, p. xix.; De Wette, *Einleitung*, § 166.
[d] *Einleitung*, iii. 396. [e] *Einl.* ii. 91. [f] *Einl.* 93. [g] *Alttest. Stud.* 70.

have

Digitized by Google

have been written *before* Ahab's time, since it makes no mention of the execution of this curse, which then took place against Hiel; yet this inference has only small force as an *argumentum e silentio*. On the name *Jerusalem* (x. 1; xviii. 28), and the distinction between the mountains of *Judah* and *Israel* (xi. 16 and 21), even De Wette[h] ventures no longer to lay weight, now that König[i] and Hävernick[k] have conclusively shown how the distinction between Israel and Judah began to be made as early as the days of Moses; whilst others had long ago remarked that there is no historical ground for assuming that the name Jerusalem was first given by David to the city of the Jebusites. Also the argument drawn by Maurer from later usage of speech has been properly dropped by De Wette, although he still adduces, in § 170, some indications of a later usage; which, however, he does not urge further, for the prudent reason that the total absence of sure traces of a later or Chaldaizing usage furnishes a significant argument *against* so late a date (see more below). There remain for De Wette only the passages xvi. 10 (the Canaanites in Gezer, as in Judges i. 29; comp. 1 Kings ix. 16), xiii. 30 (Jair's sixty cities, as in 1 Kings iv. 13; differently in Judges x. 4), and x. 13 (the book of Jasher, the mention of which is assumed to point out a time later than David). But the fact that the סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר, 'Book of Jasher,' from which the author has made a short poetic extract (x. 12-15) on Joshua's victory at Gibeon, contained also (2 Sam. i. 18) David's elegy on Saul and Jonathan, by no means proves that work to have been composed in or after David's time. It may well have been a collection of songs in praise of theocratic heroes, which began to be made in the days of Joshua; and the mention of it, therefore, speaks as little against the composition of the book by Joshua, as the mention of 'the book of the wars of the Lord' in Num. xxi. 14, does against the composition of the Pentateuch by Moses.[m] Then the noticing of Jair's sixty towns (xiii. 30, comp. with 1 Kings iv. 13) furnishes no intelligible proof of the late date of this book; for the fact that, in the time of the Judges, thirty sons of a later Jair are named as possessors of thirty of these Jair cities (Judges x. 40), by whom the ancient name of these places gained fresh significance, can in no respect speak against the accuracy of the statement in our book, or prove it to be of later date.

Finally, the book must have existed as early, at least, as the age of David, as appears from the statement (xvi. 10, comp. with 1 Kings ix. 16), that the Ephraimites 'drave not out the Ca-

[h] *Einleitung*, § 169. [i] P. 85. [k] *Einleitung*, ii. 51.
[m] Comp. Hengstenberg's *Beiträge*, iii. 223.

 naanites

Digitized by Google

naanites that dwelt in Gezer, but the Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites unto this day.' Now Pharaoh burnt the city of Gezer, slew the Canaanites in it, and then gave the place as a present to his daughter whom Solomon married in the first years of his reign; hence the destruction of the Canaanites out of Gezer cannot be dated later than the beginning of Solomon's reign, and the above statement of our book must have been made not later than towards the close of David's reign. A still earlier time is indicated by the words in xv. 63: 'As for the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Judah could not drive them out; but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day.' New David took Jerusalem from the Jebusites, and destroyed that people, at the very commencement of his reign over all the tribes, which lasted thirty-three years in Jerusalem (2 Sam. v. 6-9, comp. with ver. 5). Our passage cannot be referred to the few Jebusites whom David did not put to death, and who consequently after the capture of their stronghold continued still to dwell in Jerusalem (2 Sam. xxiv. 18, &c.), for our author declares 'the children of Judah could not drive them out.' It is admitted even by Lengerke,[n] 'that these words plainly come from an historian of the time *before* David; for David certainly *could* have driven out and destroyed the Jebusites had he chosen.'[o]

We are led still further back to the reign of Saul by ch. ix. 27: 'And Joshua made the Gibeonites that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation and for the altar of the Lord, *even unto this day, in the place which he should choose.*' According to these last words, not only was the place for the temple not decided in our author's time, which decision, however, according to 2 Sam. xxiv. 18, *seq.*, 1 Chron. xxi. 18, *seq.*, and xxii. 1, took place under David,[p] but also the Gibeonites still served the altar; the covenant made with them by Joshua and the elders of Israel remained still inviolate. Consequently these words were written before Saul's massacre of them (2 Sam. xxi.), for which the survivors had permission from David to take vengeance on Saul's family.

A date prior to David is indicated also by the notices of our book respecting the Phœnicians. In xi. 8, and xix. 28, Sidon is represented by the predicate 'great' as the metropolis of the Phœnicians, and as more powerful than Tyre; which was no longer

[n] *Kenaan*, i. 658.

[o] Even J. S. Vater (*Comm. ü. d. Pent.* iii. p. 570) escapes from this inference, already drawn by Jahn (*Einleit.* ii. 1. 165), only by means of the wholly untenable supposition, that 'the piece in xv. 20-63 is a distinct fragment, one of the older sources from which our book is derived.' Comp. also Bertholdt (*Einleit.* iii. p. 865) and B. Welte in Herbst's *Einleit.* ii. p. 95.

[p] Compare my work, *Der Tempel Salomo's*, p. 24.

the

Digitized by Google

the case in David's time, for Tyre had then quite obscured the glory of Sidon. Moreover, the inhabitants of these two cities are reckoned in xiii. 4-6, among the Canaanites who are still to be destroyed by the Israelites; David, on the contrary, stood in the most friendly relations to Tyrus (2 Sam. v. 11; 1 Kings v. 15; 1 Chron. xiv. 1), and although he subdued all the enemies of Israel, he never thought of warring against the Tyrians, and subjugating or destroying them. A writer living under David, or still later, could not have recorded this hostile attitude of the Israelites towards Tyre and Sidon, without any explanation or limitation.[q]

With this date prior to David agrees, finally, the fact, that the singer of the words in Ps. i. 2, had before his eyes God's charge to Joshua (i. 8), that he should meditate day and night in the law of the Lord. For even if the Davidic origin of this Psalm cannot be positively proved, yet the reasons which Ewald, Hitzig, Vaihinger, and others urge in proof of a later origin are devoid of force; and the psalm contains nothing at all which requires us to date it posterior to David.[r]

The

---

[q] Comp. König's *Alttest. Studien*, p. 74; Welte in Herbst's *Einleit.* ii. 1. p. 95 and Scholz's *Einl.* ii. 249.

[r] König (pp. 72-80) brings forward several other marks of the early composition of our book, but I cannot attach decisive importance to them. I infer nothing for the date of Joshua from the differences between it and Chronicles, in the names of the cities of the Simeonites and of the Priests and Levites. For even if, according to 1 Chron. iv. 31, the tribe of Simeon could have possessed the before-mentioned cities (named also in Josh. xix. 2-6) only down to David's reign, and also if the varying names of the Levitical cities in the Chronicles were either of later origin or denoted other cities assigned to the Levites at a later period, yet the author of our book was under no necessity to mention these changes, even supposing he knew them, for his object was only to give the history of the state of things in Joshua's time. In the same way I account for our author's not naming Nob among the cities of the priests, to which it certainly belonged in Saul's days (1 Sam. xxii. 19; comp. xxi. 1-9); for neither is it named in the list of such cities in 1 Chron. vi. 39, &c. The absence of Bethlehem among the cities of Judah does not show that it was not in existence or else very insignificant in Joshua's time, but is owing to a defect in the Masoretic text between xv. 59, and 60, where the names of several cities are missing. See my Comment in the note on xv. 59. König (p. 80) is in error when he maintains that our author makes no mention of Jericho after it was burnt, not even among the cities allotted to the tribes; for Jericho stands at the top of the list of the cities of Benjamin (xviii. 21); comp. also xviii. 12; xx. 8. Also the non-occurrence of the expression, 'from Dan to Beersheba,' is improperly urged by König (p. 79); for it proves nothing, since the contents of our book gave no occasion for its use, not even in xi. 17 and xii. 7. This expression is never employed to denote simply the whole length of the land from north to south, but only as descriptive of the whole nation in its extension over the whole land, from the most northerly to the most southerly city, and only in these forms—'all Israel,' 'the whole congregation,' or 'all Israel and Judah,' from Dan to Beersheba; comp. Judg. xx. 1; 1 Sam. iii. 20; 2 Sam. iii. 10; xvii. 11; xxiv. 2, 15; 1 Kings iv. 25; 1 Chron. xxii. 2; 2 Chron. xxx. 5). Further, the mention (xiii. 3; comp. Deut. ii. 23) of the Avites, that very ancient people, whom the Philistines subdued, but

 who

Digitized by Google

The result thus obtained from the historical notices of this book is further confirmed by its language. Maurer[s] has indeed adduced the orthography and language among the proofs of a very late date; but he has not established, by a single example, his assertion about the orthography; nor was it possible, for the ample collection of examples by König[t] demonstrates that the so-called *scriptio defectiva* prevails over the *scriptio plena* as completely as in any of the most ancient books of the Old Testament. And as for the words and forms of words which he has[u] cited as unquestionable signs of the later period, even De Wette[x] lays no stress on them, after Hävernick[y] and König[z] have set most of them aside. The only word that can with some show of right be considered of later use is נְכָסִים, 'riches,' in ch. xxii. 8, which occurs again only in 2 Chron. i. 11, 12; Eccles. v. 18, vi. 2; but is very common in Aramean. However, this is no sure proof that the word belongs only to the later Hebrew. Still less can this be maintained respecting עָבוּר, 'old corn,' found only in Josh. v. 11, 12. Other proofs that have been produced, so far as they possess any force at all, show rather the contrary. The word הִשְׂכִּיל belongs to the ancient Hebrew; and the meaning, *to be prosperous*, which it is said to have in ch. i. 7, 8, is entirely fanciful. The phrase 'on the west side of the Jordan' in ch. v. 1, ix. 1, xii. 7, and 'on this west side of the Jordan' in ch. xxii. 7, belongs not to the age of the captivity, but to that of Moses, since this usage, which distinguishes the subjective position of the speaker from the objective fixed geographical designation, can be explained only from the period when the Israelites had as yet gained no firm footing on this side of the Jordan.[a] The form אוֹתָם (xxiii. 15) for אֹתָם is the original regular mode, for אוֹת became אֵת at a later time,[b] and 'may be regarded as an ancient form, rather than as an archaism among later writers.'[c] Also the use of אוֹתִי for אֹתִי (xiv. 12) is found already in 2 Sam. xxiv. 24; and the change in our passage is owing to the occurrence, shortly before, of אוֹתִי three times as accusative (xiv. 7, 10, 11); so this form came readily into the mouth of Caleb in continuing his speech.[d] Not this single occurrence, but the regular change of

who are named no more afterwards, proves nothing for the date, but only for the historic truthfulness of our book. Finally, it does not follow also from Judg. i. 18 that the book of Joshua was written before the capture (as there recorded) of the Philistine cities, Gaza, Ashkelon, and Ekron.

[s] *Comment.* p. xix. [t] P. 122 *seq.* [u] P. xviii.
[x] *Einl.* § 170. [y] *Einleit.* i. 1. 198. [z] P. 113.
[a] Comp. Hengstenberg, *Beiträge*, iii. 313, and my *Comment.* on 1 Kings v. 4.
[b] Ewald's *Lehrbuch*, § 264. [c] Hävernick's *Einleit.* i. 1. 198.
[d] König, p. 116.

Digitized by Google the

the two forms, is a proof of a later usage.[e] Further, the use of the article for the relative pronoun (x. 24) is found, according to the Masora, in the most ancient writings (Gen. xviii. 21; xxi. 3; xlvi. 27; Judg. xiii. 8 *et al.*); and it could, in Ewald's opinion,[f] be always so changed, since it is itself essentially an adjective pronoun, so that there is no need whatever to explain away the instances in question by rejecting the points and regarding the forms as participles.[g] Still less is a late date established by what Maurer, after Gesenius and Ewald, has shown respecting the placing of the numeral after the thing numbered in ch. xii. 24, xv. 36 *et al.*, and the repeated neglect of the outward forms, especially in the use of the pronouns (i. 7; ii. 4, 14, 17, 20; iv. 8; xiii. 14; xviii. 17). For his first remark proceeds entirely on a false apprehension of the passages in question; and his second relates to linguistic phenomena, which are found in all parts of the Old Testament, and in the older rather oftener than in the newer. Finally, the form הֻמְסִיו, after the analogy of the Aramean (xiv. 8), cannot be reckoned a Chaldaism, since this inflection is properly the regular and oldest one, which the Hebrew dropped at an early period, while the Chaldee retained it.[h]

That these isolated terms and forms of words are not marks of a later usage, but rather traces of the most ancient condition of the language, follows of necessity from the accompanying sure signs of antique diction. We never find in our book the divine title 'Lord of hosts,' which occurs first in 1 Sam. i. 3, 11, iv. 4; and then times without number; never מַלְכוּת for 'kingdom,' which appears already in 1 Sam. xx. 31; Ps. xlv. 7; but מַמְלָכָה and מַמְלָכוּת, which is not found in a single work of the later age, except in Jer. xxvi. 1; never the prefix שֶׁ, which occurs already in Judg. vii. 12 (to say nothing of the song of Deborah), and that too in a phrase found also in our book (xi. 4), and borrowed in both cases from the Pentateuch (Gen. xxii. 17; xxxii. 13; lxi. 49);

[e] Maurer quotes ch. xxii. 19 also, but there אוֹתָנוּ is accusative, and there is no need with König to change תַּמְרֹדוּ into תַּמְרֹדוּ. Also in Levit. xv. 18, 24, where Hävernick (*Einleit.* i. 1. p. 198), and after him De Wette (*Einleit.* p. 237), finds such a change of forms, אוֹתָהּ is accusative, and should be rendered in ver. 18, 'a woman whose husband embraces her,' and in ver. 24, 'if a man embraces her.' What J. G. Sommer urges against this view of these places is not worth notice. *Bibl. Abhandlungen*, 1846, i. p. 226.

[f] *Lehrbuch*, § 321 *b*.

[g] Kleinert (*Echtheit des Jesaias*, i. p. 214) has well observed, 'it appears from the natural course of reflection, that הַ, as well as the Greek ὁ in Homer and others, might have had originally just a demonstrative and relative meaning, and thence been transformed to the mere article. That its earliest use then almost disappeared for a while, and began again to be more frequent in the later Hebrew, can cause no wonder, for there are analogies elsewhere to this phenomenon.'

[h] Ewald's *Lehrbuch*, § 142 *a*.

Digitized by Google

never

never אֶתְמוֹל for 'yesterday,' as in 1 Sam. iv. 7; v. 2; x. 11; Mic. ii. 8; Isa. xxx. 33, but only תְּמֹל or תְּמוֹל (iii. 4; iv. 18; xx. 5), as in the Pentateuch. Only thrice we meet with the suffix יֶהֶם (xi. 6, 9; xviii. 21), but the older form ם֫ very frequently. In connection with these we must bear in mind the acknowledged close relation between our book and the Pentateuch in words and modes of expression—not only in those which are singly repeated by later writers from the Pentateuch, as 'wholly followed Jehovah' (xiv. 8, 9, 14; comp. Num. xiv. 24; xxxii. 11, 12; Deut. i. 36; 1 Kings xi. 6), חֲמֻשִׁים 'armed' (i. 14; comp. Exod. xiii. 18 and Judg. vii. 11), a land flowing with milk and honey (v. 6; comp. Jer. xi. 5; xxxii. 22; Ezek. xx. 6); and אִשֵּׁי 'sacrifices,' from אִשֶּׁה (xiii. 14), which is not found again except in 1 Sam. ii. 28, where it is borrowed from the Pentateuch,—but also in those which are nowhere repeated in the subsequent writings of the Old Testament, as אַשְׁרוֹת 'springs' (x. 40); זָנָב 'the hindmost' (x. 19; comp. Deut. xxv. 25); לָלִין from לוּן, used in Exodus and Numbers to express the murmuring of the Israelites against Jehovah, which is expressed in Deut. i. 27 by רָגַן, the peculiar use of גְּבוּל 'border' (xiii. 23, 27; xv. 12, 47; comp. Num. xxxiv. 6; Deut. iii. 16, 17; also עַרְבוֹת מוֹאָב 'plains of Moab,' the peculiar appellation for the land of the Moabites (xiii. 32), of which there is no trace in the lengthy negotiation respecting this territory between Jephthah and the king of the Ammonites (Judg. xi. 12, *seq.*), so that this name could scarcely have remained in use beyond the time of Moses, since it is only borrowed in this book from the kindred passages in Numbers;[i] finally, the rare ancient forms אָתֶּנָּה (xxi. 9), like אָתֶּם (Gen. xxxii. 1); רִאשֹׁנָה 'first' (xxi. 10), which appears only once again in poetry (Job xv. 7); and הָלְכוֹא 'approach' (x. 24). According to all this evidence, the book cannot have been first written in a later period.

II. We inquire next whether, as König (p. 63, *seq.*) has sought to prove, after the example of the Talmudists and various early theologians, the whole book, with exception of xxiv. 29-33, was written by Joshua himself, or at least the first part of it, as Hävernick[k] maintains. We are obliged to reject utterly this opinion of Hävernick's as an untenable compromise. For since the unity of the book has been established in § II., there is no longer any right to speak of the composition of particular parts at different times, but only to decide whether the whole book is contemporaneous with the events and comes from the pen of

[i] Comp. Hengstenberg's *Geschichte Bileams*, p. 230. [k] *Einl.* ii. 1. 26, 62.

Digitized by Google

Joshua,

Joshua, or was written a shorter or longer time after Joshua's death. If the first part exhibit decisive marks of a contemporaneous date, these must hold good also for the second; and, on the other hand, if the second part show clear traces of the times after Joshua, then the first can, at most, be only drawn from ancient records contemporaneous with the events, and cannot have been written by Joshua in its present form. When we examine the numerous proofs which König (p. 63) has collected in favour of the contemporaneous date, we find that many of his reasons are not intended by himself to prove this point, but are urged only as evidence against a very late composition, and for a rather early one (comp., *e. g.*, his remarks, pp. 69 and 82). In favour of the composition of the book by Joshua himself, he adduces (p. 126, *seq.*) only the following:—

1. According to xxiv. 26, Joshua wrote down in the book of the law his two discourses to the assembled people (xxiii. and xxiv.), or at least his last transactions with them (xxiv.). As our book forms a united whole, 'the statement that Joshua inscribed the account of the last proceedings, directly implies that he had likewise written down in the Thorah all the previous transactions.' A like conclusion is drawn by Hävernick from the assumed original connection of the last two chapters with the *first* part of the book, which part is shown by other evidences to be a contemporaneous work. But the correctness of this conclusion is open to serious doubts. If the whole book or simply its first half furnished 'the most decisive proofs of a coeval origin,' still the statement that Joshua wrote down his last transactions with the people in the book of the law would not in the least demonstrate that he had written there also the entire history of his times. Much rather is this notice of Joshua's recording in that book only the renewal of the covenant at Shechem a strong proof that the other contents of our book were not entered in the same.

2. König, after Jahn,[m] finds a further proof in Joshua's designation as 'the servant of the Lord' in xxiv. 29. He thinks that the application of 'this most exalted title in the history of the theocracy' to Joshua only in this single passage, which records his death, necessarily involves not only that this last section has another author than the rest of the book, but also that the rest, where this deeply significant name does not occur, comes from Joshua himself; since any other writer would have applied the title not merely in this place, but also for certain throughout the book. But could not another writer find it appropriate to apply this honourable name to Joshua first in the connection, where he

[m] *Einleitung*, ii. 160.

withdraws

Digitized by Google

withdraws from the scene of the history after finishing his work and securing by his life the name of a servant of Jehovah, in order to furnish at the same time (as König beautifully observes) his simple and divine epitaph? In the fact that our author calls Joshua the servant of Jehovah first in recording his death and not sooner, I see nothing more than the peculiar delicacy and reserve of the sacred penman in praising God's chosen instruments, whose deeds are never celebrated as those of heroes; so that generally in the sacred history the human agent himself is made less prominent than that which the Lord God works by him, and the glory is ascribed to the Lord, to whom alone it is due. This delicate aversion to praising men would probably have restrained our author from so styling Joshua even in this one place, if the connection here presented, in the contrast between Israel's conduct towards God under Joshua's leadership and after his death had not demanded a judgment respecting him and his services, which is pronounced by this designation. For the biblical historians, it should be carefully observed, are so sparing in the use of this honourable name, that they give it only to those who were the Lord's servants either by virtue of their office, like the prophets, or by the Lord's own declaration. The exactly parallel passage in Judges ii. 8, is the only other place where Joshua receives this title.

3. No more does the composition of our book by Joshua follow from the repeated honourable mention of Caleb, or from the fact that the whole book breathes the spirit of Moses, which Jahn thinks could have been caught only by Joshua, the constant associate of Moses. Both points show only the historical faithfulness of the narrative and a scrupulous use of ancient sources, but not a contemporaneous date.[n] The position of the book in the canon, and the Jewish tradition in the Talmud, prove it still less. There remain now,

4. Only two passages,[o] namely, ch. v. 1 and 6, which are urged in support of the contemporaneous date.[p] But the words in ch. v. 6, 'which the Lord sware unto their fathers that he would give *us*' (לָתֵת לָנוּ), may be easily understood as implying no more than that the writer, though living later than Joshua, regarded the land as given to himself and his people, and contradistinguished himself, with his coevals then living in the land, from both the people that

---

[n] Comp. Steudel, *Ueber das Buch Josua*, Beil. 1, to his *Vorlesungen über d. Theol. d. Alttest.* p. 483.

[o] Hävernick has rightly observed (p. 27), that the other passages in ch. iv. 23; xi. 10; xv. 4; xxii. 11, as quoted by König (p. 93), do not in the least prove a contemporaneous date.

[p] Jahn, ibid.; König, p. 91; Hävernick, p. 26.

perished

Digitized by Google

perished in the wilderness through rebellion and the patriarchs.[q] As to the other place (v. 1), 'the Lord dried up the waters of the Jordan from before the children of Israel until *we were passed over*' (עַד עָבְרֵנוּ), Hävernick has not only justly observed that Ps. lxvi. 6, and lxxxi. 6, are not adapted, as poetical passages, to sustain the supposition of De Wette and Maurer, who think the expression is used by a later historian on the ground of national universality; but he has also pointed to 'we said' in Ezra v. 4, as an analogous case, which clearly shows that here we have the language of an eye-witness of the event. One might indeed be disposed to think that here (v. 1), and in Ezra v. 4,[r] the author has, without change, adopted the expression from a record contemporaneous with the events. Yet this supposition appears to me inadmissible here, because 'we were passed over' occurs in a transition verse, which is not likely to have been found by our author already in his record, unless we assume that that document contained in a compact and complete form the whole history of the conquest of Canaan—unless we, in fact, ascribe the entire first part of our book to a writer who lived in the time of the transactions, which is gainsaid by many indications. I hold, therefore, this passage to be written by the author of our book, who here speaks of himself as taking part in the passage through the Jordan; yet I cannot find in it a stringent proof of the composition of the book by Joshua, or even during his lifetime, for it is quite possible that one of the Israelites who survived him, and who had in youth passed the Jordan, wrote the history a considerable time after Joshua's death, and represented what he, with a portion of his contemporaries, had witnessed, as if it were the experience of the whole nation. The contents of various passages, which bring us down later than Joshua's day, show that the book was not composed by him or during his life. Among those passages I count not so much those which contain the oft-repeated phrase 'unto this day,' as those which mention occurrences that did not take place till after Joshua's death.

The phrase, 'unto this day,' which Spinoza and others use as a main argument against the prevailing opinion that our book is of the same date as the events, has in reality no great force, since it by no means implies (as König, p. 95, has well shown) the lapse of centuries, but it is used, according to its wholly relative sense, also in regard to things of only a few years' standing.[s] Besides its use in ch. xxii. 3, 17, and ch. xxiii. 8, 9, where no one has yet

[q] I cannot see how the contradistinction between לָנוּ and לַאֲבוֹתָם forbids our taking the words in the above sense, though Hävernick urges it as an objection in this case.

[r] Comp. my *Apol. Versuche über die Chronik*, p. 117.

[s] Comp. also Hengstenberg's *Beiträge*, iii. 326.

found

Digitized by Google

found a reference to the time after Joshua, it occurs in ch. iv. 9; v. 9; vi. 25; vii. 26; viii. 28, 29; ix. 27; xiii. 13; xiv. 14; xv. 63; and xvi. 10. Of these passages[t] some point much more to Joshua's times than to a later period; *e. g.*, the notice in ch. iv. 9, that the stones set up in the Jordan on the spot where the priests stood with the ark remained there 'unto this day,' and the remark in ch. vi. 25, that Rahab dwelt among the Israelites 'unto this day,' which must have been written before the death of Rahab, and therefore also before or soon after that of Joshua.[u] With regard also to the stones set up in the river, it is hardly to be supposed they stood there for several generations. As König, p. 101, and Welte (in Herbst's *Einleitung*, ii. 94), have already admitted, the words in ch. xiv. 14, 'Hebron became the inheritance of Caleb unto this day,' undeniably refer to the age of Joshua, since they speak only of Caleb, and not of his posterity. The remark is clearly made with a reference to the subsequent division of the land, and is not intended to say more than that no change was then made in the inheritance which Caleb had previously received at his own request, but that Hebron was given to him as a *permanent* portion, because he had wholly followed the Lord God of Israel. Also the notices that the name Gilgal, given to the Israelites' first place of encampment in Canaan, and the name Achor, given to the valley where Achan was stoned, continued 'unto this day' (v. 9; vii. 26), do not presuppose of necessity the death of Joshua, and much less the lapse of a long time after him. For in the fixing of names, the main requisite is that the name should maintain itself at the first, and so by degrees gain universal currency. When this happens, it is sure to continue down to remote futurity.[x] Accordingly the notice here presented, that the name given to a place remained, is much more needful during the first years after the events than in later time. Again, when it is stated that the great heaps of stones cast on executed criminals and hostile kings remained 'unto this day' (vii. 26; viii. 29), a long interval of time is not necessarily implied, because these heaps could scarcely last for centuries. Even the notices that the Geshurites and Maachathites dwelt among the Israelites 'unto this day,' the Jebusites also with the children of Judah in Jerusalem, and the Canaanites among the Ephraimites (xiii. 13; xv. 63; xvi. 10), may very well have been written only a few years after the division of the land; for it might have been then already manifest that the Israelites, who had taken possession

[t] To these places is usually added ch. x. 27, but quite improperly, since עַד־עָצְמָם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה is by no means equivalent in sense to עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה.

[u] Comp. Hävernick, p. 40.

[x] Comp. Hengstenberg's *Beiträge*, iii. 328.

Digitized by Google of

of the inheritance assigned to them by lot, were not in a condition to extirpate the older inhabitants that remained in the place. Nor is there anything strange in the remark that the Gibeonites, after the land was possessed by the tribes of Israel, were appointed by Joshua hewers of wood and drawers of water 'unto this day' (ix. 27). This was recorded, lest it might be thought that their condition was perhaps improved after the full conquest of the land. Sooner might a distant time after Joshua be indicated in ch. viii. 28, 'Joshua made Ai a heap for ever, even a desolation unto this day;' yet as the cities burnt in the war were certainly rebuilt soon after the division and occupation of the land, as we find, for instance, that Jericho, after being so burnt, was again inhabited in the first years of the Judges (Judg. i. 16; iii. 13), so an historian towards the end of Joshua's life, or a little later, might deem it needful to remark that Ai remained in ashes unto that day, a heap of desolation for ever, as Joshua had ordered.

Let it not be objected to these explanations, that they too much weaken the force of the terms 'unto this day.' For this objection is fully set aside by ch. xxii. 3, 17, and xxiii. 8, 9, where Joshua himself represents by the same terms not only Israel's sin in the idolatry of Baal Peor, in the fortieth year of the wandering in the wilderness, but also the taking of Canaan, as events occurring a long time ago.[y]

This expression, accordingly, proves only that our book in its existing form is not contemporaneous with the events; but it nowhere forces us to suppose that several generations or centuries had elapsed between its date and the transactions, and furnishes no sure mark for the nearer determination of its age. If the book contained nothing more than this expression to militate against its composition by Joshua, we should be quite warranted to suppose that Joshua himself wrote in it the history of his own time shortly before his death, and that some one subsequently added the notices concerning his death and Eleazar's.

But the book mentions also some circumstances which did not

---

[y] König (p. 97) tries to weaken the argument of the opponents, based on 'unto this day,' by remarking, first, that this expression occurs in the narrative only down to ch. xvi. 10; and, secondly, that it is *not* found in several later parts of the narrative, where one must have expected it, according to the author's style and whole manner of presenting things elsewhere. But a close examination of these passages (xix. 47; xxii. 34; xxiv. 26) shows in the very first of them how hazardous it is to infer much from arguments *e silentio*. If, for example, the omission to say that the name Dan, given to Leshem, continued the name of that city 'unto this day,' proved the historian to have lived at the time of the event, then this inference would hold good also for the parallel and complete account of this transaction in Judg. xviii., which in ver. 29 omits the words in question, although it bears decided marks of a later composition. Also the two other passages have not the cogency which König ascribes to them.

take

Digitized by Google

take place till after Joshua's death. Among these we reckon the capture of Hebron by Caleb, of Debir by Othniel (xv. 13-19), and of Leshem by the Danites (xix. 47). These conquests might, it is true, so far as can be gathered from our book alone, have been made before Joshua's death, since he lived several years after dismissing the people to their inheritances (xix. 50 and xxiii. 1; comp. with xxii. 4 and xxi. 43).[2] But it is clear from the parallel places in Judg. i. 10-15 and xviii., that these cities were taken after his decease We see further from Judg. i. 21, that the remark in Josh. xv. 63 about the inability of the children of Judah to drive out the Jebusites applies equally to the time after Joshua, since it implies the attack on Jerusalem mentioned after his death in Judg. i. 8, after which capture the Jebusites still maintained themselves in the place along with the Israelites. According to these positive statements, we must compare also the other parallel passages of our book with the book of Judges, and not only refer to the same time the notices in Josh. xiii. 2-5 and Judg. iii. 3; Josh. xvi. 10 and Judg. i. 29; Josh. xvii. 11 and Judg. i. 27, 28, about the non-expulsion of the Canaanites out of various districts and cities, but also regard the account of the death of Joshua and Eleazar, and of the entombing of Joseph's bones (xxiv. 29-33), as an original part of our book. There is no good ground for taking these concluding verses for a later addition, except the assumption already disproved above, that the whole book besides was written by Joshua himself.

While, then, these passages together exclude the composition of the book by Joshua, or during his life, and point to the time after his death, yet they by no means force us to think that the author lived a very long period after Joshua. For all that they relate might very well have happened within twenty-five years after his departure from earth. It would certainly make a difference, if it were true that the above passages, which our book has in common with Judges, were borrowed from the latter, as Maurer, Hävernick, and Bertheau[3] conjecture. But the error of this hypothesis has been already shown in the article just referred to, in Rudelbach and Guericke's *Zeitschrift*. We can, therefore, close our inquiry thus far with the result, that the contents and form, the historical allusions, as well as the philological peculiarities of our book, not only disprove entirely its composition during the captivity, but also forbid us to fix its date in the times of Samuel, Saul, or David, and rather indicate that it was written within a generation

[2] See my article in Rudelbach and Guericke's *Zeitschrift*, 1846, p. 27.
[3] *Das Buch der Richter.*

Digitized by Google after

after Joshua's death. But by whom? On this point we can form no certain conjectures, owing to the scantiness of our historical information about the entire period of the Judges. Yet, if a conjecture may be allowed, I hold that one of the elders who survived Joshua a long while, and had seen all Jehovah's works, which he did for Israel (xxiv. 31; Judg. ii. 7), wrote our book in the evening of his life, partly from recollection of what he had himself witnessed, and partly from contemporaneous documents and records.

§ IV. *The Credibility of the Book of Joshua.*

The credibility or historical truthfulness of every narrative work rests either on the author's greater or less, closer or remoter, connection with the transactions, or on the faithful and intelligent use of original sources; and it must indicate itself by the agreement of the spirit and character of the history with the idea that determines the spirit and character of the persons and times described. If we apply this rule to our book, the author of which, though unknown, appears nevertheless from ch. v. 1 to be contemporary with the events, and to have passed through the Jordan under Joshua, we are at once authorized to expect a trustworthy history of the times and doings of Joshua. But if we consider the particular contents of our book, we shall be obliged to assume the use of written notices, if not of official documents, at least in the second half, for the history of the division of Canaan among the tribes, with the full description of the boundaries of their respective territories, the lists of their cities, &c. This supposition is confirmed by the special notice in ch. xviii. 1-10, that, after the settling of the territories of Judah and Joseph, Joshua appointed a commission 'to describe the rest of the land into seven parts in a book.' In regard to this *description* (תֹּאַר, xviii. 9) it has already been asked by Bertholdt,[b] 'Is not this description the chorographies which are given down from ver. 12 with some interruptions?' And even if it is not, inasmuch as that description could only form the basis for the distribution by lot, and the exact specification of the district assigned to each tribe according to the number of its families could be given only after the casting of the lots; yet it lies in the nature of such arrangements, that they can be fixed for permanence and acquire the force of regulations only by being put on record. Such validity must have belonged to the land-survey of the duly appointed commissioners, in order to prevent

[b] *Einleitung*, iii. 857.

future

Digitized by Google

future contentions about the boundaries. That these written or official documents actually form the basis of the chorographies of our book appears beyond doubt from the fact, that the result of the first division in Gilgal is furnished with documentary fulness, although it was altered in many particulars by the second division which followed soon after in Shiloh, when Judah and Ephraim were obliged to give up several places and tracts to the other tribes.[c] Why should a later writer, as König (p. 71) has properly asked, make prominent the fact that too much land and too many cities were given at first to the tribe of Judah, and specify *all* that had been so given, whilst he states that the whole tribe of Simeon and most of Dan afterwards received their portion from the same, where he again counts up what he had already adduced in connection with Judah? And we may add, that such minuteness would have been quite impossible for a later historian without original records. The use of such documents appears also clearly from a comparison of similar lists preserved in 1 Chron. iv. 28-32 and vi. 39-66. These lists of the cities of Simeon and also of the priestly and levitical cities vary so much from those in Josh. xix. 2-8 and xxi., not only in many names, but also partly in the disposition, that the compiler of the Chronicles cannot have drawn them from our book, but must have used ancient and independent lists.[d] If, accordingly, lists of this sort, independent of our book, were preserved in copies and fragments till after the captivity, and were as ancient national documents rescued from destruction by their insertion in the Chronicles, we are all the more at liberty to assume that the author of our book made use of the records which at the partition of the land had been prepared concerning the respective inheritances of the tribes. A very probable confirmation of this is found also in the fact, that repeatedly in the lists of cities the sum named at the end does not agree with the total number of the several cities, but is generally smaller, because possibly the author added some names to the original statements without afterwards altering the sum of them.

But we do not confine the use of original sources to the cho-

[c] Eichhorn (*Einleit.* iii. p. 365) has well observed on this point: 'The accounts of our book about the partition of the land bear still here and there marks of an official record, which, according to its nature, never gives at once the whole arrangement in a brief abstract, but sets forth things according to their gradual advance, with all the changes, amendments, and additions occurring from time to time and step by step. Thus it mentions how one tribe that got too much at first gave up afterwards whole tracts to others, in order to make up their full portion of land. Accordingly, the tribe of Simeon afterwards gets its inheritance in the midst of the children of Judah (Josh. xix. 9), and several cities, which, according to Josh. xv., Judah had taken into possession (?), pass over to the tribe of Dan (Josh. xix. 40).

[d] Comp. my *Apol. Versuche über die Chronik*, pp. 174, 182.

rographies

Digitized by Google

rographies of our book, but we venture also to extend it to the narrative parts. Since Joshua, according to ch. xxiv. 26, wrote in the book of the law the transaction at Shechem in the renewal of the covenant, that so a written notice of this act might lie in the book of the law as a witness against the people before the Lord in the sanctuary, we may well suppose also that other weighty events were recorded in writing immediately after they took place, that so the remembrance of the Lord's wonderful dealings with his people might be brought down to posterity, undistorted and unweakened. Since also certain men, according to ch. x. 13, felt impelled to celebrate the mighty deeds of that age in songs, there would not have been wanting others to relate these deeds with historical accuracy. It is true that in the historical sections the sources cannot be traced with as much evidence as in the geographical chapters; yet indications can scarcely be denied to exist in the list of the Canaanitish kings slain by Joshua (xii. 7, *seq.*); in the portions found alike in our book and in Judges, viz., xv. 13, *seq.*, comp. with Judg. i. 10, *seq.*, the almost verbal agreement of which, in connection with mutual independence, can scarcely be explained except by the use in common of a written document; in the speech of Caleb (xiv. 6, *seq.*), which 'has too strong features of a speech from the mouth of a veteran of 85 years, and in every word, in its circumstantiality and personal traits, indicates too much his spirit and his age and his position to have been merely put into his mouth by a later historian, who had placed himself in his exact position' (Eichhorn, p. 366); in the speech of Phinehas and the answer of the two tribes and a half in ch. xxii.;[e] in the complaint of the tribe of Joseph, on account of the smallness of their allotment, and Joshua's reply (xvii. 14, *seq.*), and in other narratives to which even Ewald[f] allows a 'high rank for historical ancientness and graphic effect.' If, then, the author of our book related partly what he had himself witnessed, and partly what he found in contemporaneous records and public documents, he was fully in a position to hand down a trustworthy account of the theocratic nation under Joshua's leadership; and that he did not lack intellectual competency, but that he has actually handed down a reliable history of that time, every unprejudiced reader will perceive from the contents of his work. He throughout shows himself conversant with the most special facts. He knows the number of the warriors out of the two and a half tribes who crossed the Jordan with their brethren to help them to conquer

[e] Comp. Jahn's *Einleit.* ii. p. 170, and Berthold's *Einleit.* p. 859.
[f] *Geschichte*, ii. p. 227.

Canaan

Digitized by Google

Canaan (iv. 13); also the population of Ai (viii. 25), with the number of the fighting men first despatched against this city, and of the slain among them (vii. 4, 5), and the strength of the force that lay in ambush between Bethel and Ai (viii. 12). He knows the ancient Canaanitish names of many cities, that had become obsolete after Israel took possession of the land, as Baalah (xv. 9) and Kirjath-baal (xv. 60), *i. e.* Kirjath-jearim, Har-jearim, *i. e.* Chesalon (xv. 10), Kirjath-arba, *i. e.* Hebron (xiv. 15; xv. 54), Kirjath-sepher (xv. 16), and Kirjath-sannah, *i. e.* Debir (xv. 49), and many more. He gives with the greatest minuteness the boundaries of the tribes, so that with our increasing acquaintance in detail with the soil of Palestine by means of modern travels, we see more and more how correctly all the boundary-lines are laid down, not only in all their curves and turns, but also according to the elevations and depressions of the ground.[g] But our author manifests the greatest historical truthfulness not merely in these mere external things, but also in his conception of the whole period; in his portraiture of the several prominent characters, as Joshua, Caleb, and Phinehas; in his description of the particular events with their motives and consequences, and in the selection and treatment of his materials. In all these things he shows himself a man of talent, who penetrates into the relations of events, so as not merely to describe their outward progress, but also to comprehend the higher idea manifesting itself in each, who, in short, understands how to contemplate and exhibit the history in the light of divine revelation. Yet this very advantage, which the theocratic historiography possesses over the ordinary way of contemplation, exhibiting history in accordance with particular human systems and philosophical principles, is a ground of offence to our neological critics, so that they deny the *historical* character of our book, and declare its contents to be fabulous and mythical wherever they pass beyond the bounds of daily occurrences. They even go so far as to maintain that the author 'had no historical design, but wished merely to represent the fulfilment of the ancient promises in the complete conquest of the land by Joshua, and to furnish a model of theocratic loyalty, without at all caring whether the existing ancient accounts agreed with his statement, and whether this was even consistent with itself.'[h] This assertion,

[g] In these internal marks we have a much stronger proof of the credibility of our book than in the story of Procopius (*Vandal.* ii. 10) cited by many, and last by Scholz (*Einleit.* i. p. 694), about two pillars of white stone found in the city of Tingis (Tangar) in Numidia, with the inscription in the Phœnician tongue: 'We are fugitives before Joshua, the son of Naveh, the robber.' This story can scarcely be anything else than a rabbinical tradition, which Procopius might have heard from African Jews. Comp. Ant. van Dale, *De Orig. et Prog. Idololatriæ*, p. 749, &c.

[h] De Wette, *Einleit.*, pp. 230, 236; Hauff, p. 191.

in

Digitized by Google

in its last part, has been already disproved in § II. The rest of it is based on the utterly perverse dogmatical assumptions, that the account of the labours of a man of God must be unhistorical, simply because the life of this servant of the Lord forms a model of the faithful observance of the law and of the fear of God; that the narration of the fulfilment of ancient promises can lay claim to no historical truth, simply because the promises so fulfilled presuppose real prophecies, which do not exist on the principles of rationalism; that, finally, every notice of supernatural events is *eo ipso* fabulous and mythological, because everything comes to pass in the world according to unchangeable laws of nature, and the Almighty God must not be allowed to stretch out his hand from the clouds to meddle with men's affairs. We will not stop to confute such absurdities, but simply touch on the question, whether the contents of our book are at variance with the biblical and reasonable ideas of God and of his righteousness? For one of the champions among the rationalist critics, Eichhorn, in his *Einleit.* iii. p. 403, exclaims, 'how godless are the contents of the book of Joshua! God is made not only to bestow on the Israelites, against all right, the country which the Canaanites most equitably held as the first occupiers, but also to form a shocking plan for its conquest, and to command without reserve the most horrible bloodshed in the total destruction of the Canaanites. Who can reconcile this with even tolerably correct views of God?' This offence was long ago taken at the history of the book by the heathen, the Manicheans, the English deists, and the German naturalists.[h] Eichhorn,[i] Herder,[k] Paulus, and all the rationalists who have attempted an explanation, and not despaired, with mythical scepticism, of historically comprehending the book, *i. e.* of ascertaining and determining its historical kernel, have sought to set aside the difficulty by distinguishing between the history proper and the narrator's exhibition or view of it according to his contracted religious ideas and the theocratical conceits of the Jews. But Hävernick[m] has convincingly shown how little this arbitrary distinction can promote the real understanding of our book—how, in fact, it involves inextricable self-contradictions. The wonderful accounts of the book of Joshua do not stand there isolated, but find support in the Pentateuch on the one hand, and in the later historical, prophetical, and poetical writings of the Old Testament on the other; and they can be properly compre-

[h] See the examples in Lilienthal's *Gute Sache d. Göttl. Offenbarung*, part 4, p. 891, *seq.*; W. A. Bachienne's *Hist. u. Geogr. Beschreibung von Palestina*, i. 2, p. 194; and Hengstenberg's *Beiträge*, iii. p. 471.

[i] *Loc. cit.* [k] *Geist der Heb. Poesie*, 1787, ii. p. 187.

[m] *Einleit.* ii. p. 3 *seq.*

 hended

Digitized by Google

hended and judged of only in their intimate connection with the whole revelation of the ancient covenant.

It is quite correctly assumed in Eichhorn's objection, that the Israelites' title to the possession of Canaan rested not on any human claims and rights, but only on the divine grant. This is most decidedly and clearly declared throughout the book, in perfect agreement with the entire Old Testament. Comp. Gen. xii. 7; xiii. 15; xv. 18; xvii. 8; xxiv. 7; xxvi. 3, 4; xxviii. 4, 13; xxxv. 12; Exod. xxiii. 31; Levit. xx. 24; xxv. 2; Num. xv. 2; xxxiii. 53; xxxiv. 2, *seq.*; Deut. iii. 18; iv. 1, 21, 40; vii. 13; viii. 1; xi. 9 *et sæpe;* Josh. i. 2, 3, 6, 11, 15; ii. 9; v. 6; xviii. 3; xxi. 43; xxiii. 3-5, 13-16; xxiv. 13; Judg. ii. 1; 2 Sam. vii. 10; 1 Kings viii. 34, 40; ix. 7; 2 Chron. vi. 25, 27, 31; vii. 20; Neh. ix. 8, 15; Jer. xvi. 15; xxx. 3; Ezek. xx. 15, 28; Ps lxxviii. 54; and many more places. All attempts to set aside this view of the matter, and to justify Israel's conquest of Canaan by arbitrarily supposing they had ordinary human claims to its possession, have been admirably exploded by Hengstenberg in his article on the claims of the Israelites to Palestine,[a] where he has also utterly refuted all objections against the scriptural view. But the fundamental error of our opponents lies in their equally unbiblical and irrational ideas of God and his government of the world, which lead them, *à priori*, to deny to the Godhead any living influence, any spiritual working upon the earth and its inhabitants, so that He can do men 'neither good nor harm' (Jer. x. 5). On the contrary, the Lord, the God of Israel, the almighty maker, upholder, and ruler of heaven and earth, is 'the living God and an everlasting king' (Jer. x. 10), who has determined for the nations not only the bounds of their habitation, but also the times before appointed, that they should seek him, if haply they might feel after him and find him (Deut. xxxii. 8; Acts xvii. 26-28); who, while he has given to every nation upon earth life and being, property and land, for a right use in promoting their own happiness by glorifying the divine name, possesses also the power and right to take away all that they have, and to destroy them from the face of the earth, when they dishonour and reproach God's name by the constant abuse of the blessings and gifts they receive. This only true God, who governs the earth in eternally unchangeable wisdom and righteousness, and reveals to all the children of men not less his anger by great judgments than his grace by countless blessings, had promised to give the land of Canaan to Abraham's posterity, so soon as the iniquity of the Amorites, its possessors at that time, should

[a] *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1833, Nos. 6-11, and also *Beiträge*, iii. p. 471 *seq.*

be

Digitized by Google

be full, *i. e.* should have reached its highest pitch (Gen. xii. 7; xv. 13-16). We must accordingly regard equally the expulsion of the Canaanites out of their legal but abused and forfeited possession as an act of divine judgment, and the gift of the land to Israel as an act of God's free favour. And there is thus a perfect justification of the extirpation of the Canaanites as a work commanded by God, and of Israel's taking possession of their forfeited inheritance (comp. Levit. xviii. 24-28; Deut. xii. 29-31), provided the Israelites only acted in the matter (as our book testifies) as instruments in the Lord's hands. The children of Israel were not, however, by the divine grant alone authorized to wage a war of extermination against the Canaanites, even as David did not believe himself authorized, by the promise of the kingdom and the anointing given him by Samuel at God's command, to kill Saul and to snatch the promised kingdom by his own might, although the king had been rejected by the Lord; they left Egypt for Canaan not of their own will and in their own might, but were led by the God of their fathers with a mighty arm out of the land of bondage, and through the wilderness into the land of promise. As Moses acted by God's immediate command, so did Joshua also; and that this command was not grounded on fancy, but on fact, is proved by the visible signs whereby God owned the hosts of Israel as ministers of his avenging justice, contending in his name and authority, the miracles whereby the Lord of the whole earth divided the waters of Jordan before them, cast down the walls of Jericho, filled the Canaanites with fear and dismay, slew them at Gibeon with hailstones, and discomfited all their efforts to resist Israel, so that Joshua smote and destroyed great and strong nations, and none could withstand him. Hence the Psalmist could say, 'Thou didst drive out the heathen with thy hand, and plantedst them (the Israelites); thou didst afflict the people, and cast them out. For they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them; but thy right hand, and thine arm, and the light of thy countenance, because thou hadst a favour unto them' (Ps. xliv. 2, 3). Whilst Israel is thus shown to be the executor of God's judgments, this his calling is also fully carried into practice through his whole demeanour in accomplishing the work imposed. The nation willingly obeyed all the orders of Joshua; sanctified themselves by the circumcision and the keeping of the Passover at Gilgal; renewed the covenant with the Lord on Ebal and Gerizim; executed God's ban upon the Canaanites; punished the contempt of this ban in Achan and his house, in order to put away sin from the midst of them; vowed most solemnly, after entering into the quiet possession of their promised inheritance, to abstain from all

Digitized by Google

idolatry; to obey Jehovah their God only, and to hearken to his voice; and did actually serve the Lord, so long as Joshua lived and the surviving elders, who knew all the works of the Lord which he did for Israel.

Thus the entire contents of the book find their higher unity and their truth in the idea of the Divine righteousness, holiness, and mercy, as that idea manifested itself most illustriously in a great fact of the world's history. While the righteousness is revealed against the Canaanites and the mercy towards the Israelites, the holiness of the Almighty God is revealed in both cases; in the destruction of the criminal Canaanites, and in the choice of the Israelites to enjoy communion with the Lord by holiness of life in the faithful discharge of his calling; in both to the honour of God and the glory of his name.

§ V. *Exegetical Helps.*

Ephraem Syri, *Explanatio in lib. Josuæ*, in 1st vol. of his *Opera Syriace.*

Theodoreti, *Questiones in Josuam*, in 1st vol. of his *Opera*, ed. Schulze.

Aurel. Augustini, *Questiones in lib. Josuæ*, in vol. iii. of his *Opera*, Antwerp, 1700. fol.

R. Sal. Jarchi (Rashi), *Comment. Heb. in lib. Josuæ*, &c., Lat. vers. a Jo. Fr. Breithaupto, Goth., 1714. 4to.

Jo. Calvini, *Commentarii in libros Mosis necnon in lib. Josuæ*, Amstel., 1667. fol.

Nic. Serarius, *Comment. in lib. Josuæ* &c., vol. i., Mog., 1609. fol.

Andreas Masius, *Josuæ Imperatoris historia illustrata*, Antwerp, 1574. fol.

Dav. Chytræi, *In hist. Josuæ, &c., Explicationes utilissimæ*, Lips., 1592. fol. (This gives a practical unfolding of the *loci doctrinæ præcipui in Hist. Josuæ observandi.*)

J. A. Osiander, *Commentarius in Josuam*, Tüb., 1681. fol.

J. Christ. Ising, *Exercitationes historicæ in Pent. et lib. Josuæ*, Regiom., 1683. 4to.

Seb. Schmidt, *Annotationes in lib. Josuæ*, appended to his *Comment. in Jesaiam*, ed. 2, Francf., 1692. 4to.

Critici Sacri, containing *Annotata in lib. Josuæ*, by Seb. Münster, Fr. Vatablus, Isid. Clarius, A. Masius, Jo. Drusius, and Hugo Grotius, vol. i., ed. 2, Francf., 1696. fol.

Synopsis Criticorum, &c., adorn. a Matth. Polo, vol. i, Francf., 1694. 4to.

Corn. à Lapide, *Comment. in Josuam*, &c., Antwerp, 1718. fol.

Jo. Clerici, *Veteris Test. libri hist.*, &c., ed. nova, Tüb., 1783. fol.

Digitized by Google

Aug. Calmet, *Commentaire littéral sur le V. Test.*,—*Josué, les Juges*, &c., Paris, 1711. 4to.

J. Dav. Michaelis, *Anmerkungen für Ungelehrte, zu s. deutscher Uebersetzung des A. Test.*, Theil. v. 1, Gott., 1774. 4to.

Jo. Christ. Frid. Schulzii, *Scholia in Vet. Test.*, vol. ii. Norimb., 1784. 8vo.

Exegetisches Handbuch des A. Testaments, 1 Stück, *nebst Nachträgen* im 3 Stücke, Leipzig, 1797. 8vo.

Thadd. Ant. Dereser, *Anmerkungen zu der von Dom. v. Brentano und ihm herausgg. Heil. Schrift des A. Test.*, Th. ii. Bd. 1., Frank., 1801. 8vo.

F. J. V. D. Maurer, *Commentar über das Buch Josua*, Stuttg., 1831. 8vo.

Ern. Fr. Car. Rosenmülleri, *Scholia in Vet. Test.*, P. xi., vol. i., *Josuam continens*, Lips., 1833. 8vo.

THEOBALD THAMER;[a]

AN HISTORICAL MONOGRAPH.

By Dr. Augustus Neander,

Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, &c. &c.[b]

History enables us to discover within the hidden laboratories of the human soul the germs of those spiritual tendencies from which have proceeded the greatest revolutions in the history of the world, so far as they were capable of being accomplished by merely human powers. It enables us to perceive how such spiritual tendencies gradually develop themselves, in conflict with opposing forces, until they have become strong enough to vanquish the latter, and finally to break through all the barriers which

[a] Theobald Thamer, der Repräsentant und Vorgänger moderner Geistesrichtung in dem Reformationszeitalter [Theobald Thamer, the Representative and Forerunner of Modern Spiritual Tendencies in the Period of the Reformation]. Eine historische Monographie von Dr. August Neander. Berlin: C. G. Lüderitz, 1842. Pp. iv. and 53, 8vo.

[b] The following forms the preface which Dr. Neander gives to this remarkable monograph:—

'The interest I take in the *genetic* investigation of history, and in the study of individual peculiarities which are capable of being regarded as representative of entire spiritual tendencies, made me wish long ago to undertake a more particular inquiry

Digitized by Google

which stand in their way. This is especially true of rationalism —taking the word in its most general sense, in the philosophical as well as the theological signification—since the theological rationalism, which is opposed to supranaturalism, leads back to the philosophical rationalism, which is to be contrasted with empirism, positivism; and since the theological form of rationalism first finds its consistent development and its completion in the philosophical, when reason has succeeded in setting aside every limit to pure thinking, bringing everything into her crucible and sending it forth again in a sublimated form, in every object finding again merely herself and the product of her own activity. Inasmuch as the religious interest is more widely diffused than the philosophical, it came to pass that this reaction of the reason, striving after exclusive supremacy against the positive, made its appearance at first in a more indistinct and covert manner in the phenomena of the religious world, before it was able to express itself, with greater clearness and perfectly developed consciousness, in the phenomena of philosophy. Thus, in the history of the sects of the Middle Ages, we see this reaction break forth under the cover of various forms of mysticism: and perhaps a mightier revolution might sooner have proceeded from this tendency in conflict with the enforced positivism of the Church, from

---

inquiry with regard to T. Thamer, to whose importance K. A. Menzel has also, in more recent times, directed attention. But I had not access to Thamer's own writings, from which alone an adequate knowledge of his character and the whole course of its development is to be derived. I had certainly every reason to suppose, from the extracts given by Salig, that amongst the rich treasures of the ducal library at Wolfenbüttel these singular mental productions were also to be found; and I had received many proofs, such as impose upon me the obligation of hearty and grateful acknowledgment, of the obliging kindness with which the esteemed director of the library, Dr. Schönemann, renders assistance to all exertions of a literary character. But the mistake of a tourist led me to the belief that my supposition was without foundation; although I learned afterwards that I might long ago have had from Wolfenbüttel all those works of Thamer's which I have here made use of, except one. However, in the autumn of last year I spent some little time in the imperial city of Germany; and the special kindness, often experienced by me before, of Chevalier Kopitar, who had established a manifold claim to my gratitude, having facilitated to me the use of the treasures contained in the library there, I then made those extracts from Thamer's writings which I have since used, first for an Essay read at a sitting of the historico-philosophical class in the Royal Academy of Sciences, and then for the present work.

'Thus much concerning the origin of this monógraph, which I have been able to undertake only as a secondary occupation. May the labours of Dr. Förstemann of Halle, to whom the friends of the history of the Reformation are already indebted for so many important communications and so much new information, have the effect of bringing to light yet much more that shall conduce to a more accurate and profound perception of the pre-indications of modern spiritual tendencies in the period of the Reformation, and thereby to a better understanding of the present in its genetic development'! We await with eagerness the new communications of this faithfully diligent, unweariedly inquiring scholar.

'Berlin, Aug. 9, 1842.' 'A. Neander.'

Digitized by Google which

which the nations, striving as they were after a new development, must have felt themselves continually more and more alienated, had not the Reformation come between, and by the force of a positive religious interest, which moved the minds of all, given another turn to the spirits that were sighing after liberty. What the great Melanchthon, with the profound insight of a prophet, once said,[c] 'Quæ fortasse longe graviores tumultus aliquando excitatura fuerunt, nisi Lutherus exortus esset, ac studia hominum alio traxisset,' is applicable in this connection also. But then, again, in the midst of the great ferment which was produced by the Reformation, we see this reaction newly emerge, and rise in opposition against the principle of the Reformation itself. It knew how to turn to account the characteristics of *one-sidedness* that attached to this principle in the form in which it at first appeared, by directing its attacks against them. Still its time, its hour, was not yet come; it was once more obliged to give way to a mightier spirit. One of the most remarkable appearances of the kind we have mentioned is presented in the case of the man whose course of development and whose peculiar opinions we now propose to take into consideration.

Theobald Thamer is to be reckoned amongst the men who have passed away without leaving any trace in their own age, because they were too foreign to it to be capable of influencing it to any great extent, but who are of so much the more consequence as having pre-indicated a development which was yet to come. He was born at Rossheim, in Lower Alsace, studied theology at Wittemberg, and there became a zealous disciple of Luther and Melanchthon. After having, in the year 1539, obtained his Master's degree, he betook himself to Frankfort on the Oder, where he made his first attempt at teaching in public. The Landgrave Philip of Hesse, the zealous promoter of all studies by which the interests of the Evangelical Church might be served, had previously contributed towards his support, perhaps with the hope of being able to employ him in his own service at some later period. The correspondence of Duke Albert of Prussia, published by Vogt, furnishes many fine examples of the liberality with which the princes who were devoted to the interests of the Evangelical Church were accustomed at that time to undertake the support of such young men. Thamer's patron just mentioned called him to Marburg, in the year 1543, as Professor of Theology and preacher at the church of St. Elizabeth in that city.

In the same year, perhaps upon taking possession of his ap-

---

[c] In a letter to Camerarius, A.D. 1529, *Corp. Ref.*, tom. i. p. 1083.

pointment,

Digitized by Google

pointment, he published an exhortation to the study of theology.[d] We recognize him in this publication as the enthusiastic adherent of the Reformation, the zealous disciple of Luther and Melanchthon. He sought to excite the young to the study of theology, by a reference to the great work which the Reformation had accomplished in bringing to light again the truth of God. Thus he says: 'What in the time of our fathers was covered with thick darkness, obscured by old wives' fables and a multitude of lies, has, through the exertions of our teachers, become so clear and intelligible that we can almost grasp it with our hands.' He also followed the tendency which then prevailed amongst the Protestants in their unfavourable, and in part unjust, judgment concerning the great men of the scholastic theology. In order, he says, to understand how much we are indebted to the Reformation, we need only to cast a glance into the writings of Thomas Aquinas and others of the same stamp. He calls Luther the '*princeps theologorum hujus ætatis*,' and commends in particular his Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. Melanchthon he designates '*communis præceptor*,' and his celebrated '*Loci*' are, in Thamer's estimation, '*libellus aureus*' and '*opus plane divinum*.' 'Thou needst not now,' thus he expresses himself, 'undertake any long or dangerous journey, nor go on pilgrimage to St. Jago di Compostella or to the Holy Land, nor risk thy life before the fury of the Turks, nor part from wife and children; that which is needful for thee thou hast at home, it is before thy door, it is offered to thee spontaneously, if thou wilt but have it.' He applies in this connection the passage, Rom. x. 6,[e] et seq. He censures the prevailing ingratitude with regard to so great a blessing of God; he complains, much in the same way as Melanchthon, that the young neglected theology, occupying themselves chiefly about pursuits which brought material gain, as was seen from the small number of those who then sought to prepare themselves for the sacred office, whereas formerly, on the contrary, there had been so many zealous suitors for the rich benefices. 'In former times,' he says, 'when not a *theologia* but a *mateologia* (ματαιολογία) formed the staple of discourse, a doctrine which could not give consolation, but which filled the conscience with unrest, what multitudes of priests roved about through the world! But now, when God has given us again the knowledge of his word, we avoid this study, so that in the whole host of students one scarcely sees one amongst thousands who is willing to occupy himself with this

[d] Theobaldi Thameri Adhortatio ad theologiæ studium in academia Marburgensi. 1543.

[e] In the original, by an evident mistake, it is Rom. xvi. 6.—Tr.

salutary

Digitized by Google

salutary study, unless they happen to be such as are induced to it by poverty, or by mistrust of their intellectual endowments.'[f] Such contempt of the Divine Word seems to him to give reason to expect a heavy punitive judgment at the hand of God. He then takes notice of the objection that theology is so obscure a science: he thinks that this is the fault of those who have called it so, because they had a veil upon their hearts; yet, he says, it is certainly true that the study of theology gives a man more trouble than the arts of common life. He goes on to point out what is requisite in order to the study of this science—the study of the Bible, the knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and of German, in order to be able to preach, as all ought to do.

Even at this period we discover the germs of his later tendency, when he particularly insists upon the necessity of an acquaintance with natural science, in order that a man may learn rightly to understand and apply the language of the Bible, where it speaks of the works of God in nature; also of a knowledge of ethics, in regard to which, however, he shows himself still a thorough adherent of the evangelical doctrine of justification, expressing himself thus concerning the use of this study: 'In order to perceive the nature of good, of virtue and of vice, so that we may learn to understand the difference between our own righteousness and that which avails before God, so that we may not wander from the true doctrine of the Gospel, confounding the Divine and the human, in which error our fathers lay deeply involved.' He reckons further among the studies necessary for the theologian, eloquence, dialectics, and history. Yet, he says, no one ought to allow himself to be deterred by the difficulties which present themselves, but every one should be so much the more stimulated by the contemplation of them. He places in comparison the difficulty of other studies, especially that of Aristotle: he had once heard his instructor Melanchthon, when expounding Aristotle's Analytics, declare publicly from the *cathedra*, that there was no one yet who fully understood this work. He says of himself that he had spent two whole years and more in trying to understand the Organon of Aristotle. He then adds: 'I venture to assert that the name of this mortal was formerly used in all the schools —and is yet in most of them—more frequently than the name of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and that there were more Aristotelians than there were of such as named themselves after Christ, a statement which it is shocking to hear amongst Christians, but one which is nevertheless true.' He appeals to the fact that

[f] 'Itaque nunc vulgo coeptum est dici de stupidis male sanis et bardis, ut ad extremum omnibus infeliciter cadentibus, evangelii doctores evadere possint.'

everything

Digitized by Google

everything good is full of difficulty; but the question, wherefore it cannot be otherwise, is one to which all the philosophers put together would not be able to render a satisfactory reply: theology alone gives us to understand that it is on account of sin we are obliged to eat our bread in the sweat of our brow.

Thamer laboured in both his offices with great zeal;[g] he possessed such gifts as are adapted to produce great effect in a season of excitement, at least for a short time: multitudes flocked to his sermons. But it is likely that he may have belonged to the class of preachers who sacrificed everything for the sake of effect, and delighted in paradoxes and piquant turns, and of whose influence upon the minds of the multitude Melanchthon was often obliged to complain. He seems from the beginning to have endeavoured to show his cleverness in allegorizing interpretations of the Bible: the Landgrave, who valued him highly, often found fault with his sermons on this account.[h] Nor was he able to live long in peace with his colleagues; his violent, restless spirit soon urged him to kindle strife. This happened, in the first instance, before he had departed from the (mental or doctrinal) position which he had occupied in the composition of his first work already noticed. According to his custom, of apprehending with rugged one-sidedness whatever he took up, he came forward at first in defence of the letter of the Lutheran doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper. It was just in that year in which the peace that had, to the joy of all the well disposed, been re-established in the Evangelical Church by the Concord of Wittemberg, was threatened to be again disturbed by the newly excited passion of Luther, whose temper was ruffled by sickness and manifold annoyance—the year 1544. This public step of Thamer's was exceedingly unwelcome to the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, who had been striving for many years to do away with the division which had been occasioned among the Protestants by the difference with regard to the Eucharist, and he made him acquainted with his dissatisfaction on account of it. But this was merely a transitory thing, and Thamer must soon have regained the favour of the Landgrave, for in the year 1546 he accompanied the latter as military chaplain in the war of Schmalkald. While this was proceeding, in the year 1547, Thamer published a treatise on the question, 'Whether, and in what cases, a Christian may resort to flight?'[i] As a motto he prefixed the passages,

[g] See the account of Thamer, by John Lauzen, a contemporary, secretary to the Chancery at Cassel, published in F. L. Schminke's *Monimenta Hassiaca*, iv. 461; and the article 'Thamer,' in Strieder's *Hessischer Gelehrtengeschichte* (History of Learned Hessians), b. xvi.

[h] See a later portion of this narrative.

[i] An et quatenus Christiano sit fugiendum, Tractatus ii.

Digitized by Google

Prov. xxviii. 1, 'The wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are bold as a lion;' and Jer. li. 6, 'Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and deliver every man his soul.' The design of this treatise is to exhort to stedfastness in the confession and defence of Protestant doctrine, amidst the dangers threatened by the advance of the imperial army. Remarkable is the freedom with which he assails the authority of the ancient teachers of the Church, and especially of Athanasius, in a style of language which quite bears the impress of the zealous Lutheranism of that period.[k] He calls it the delusion of the multitude to believe that everything which has been done by holy men is well-pleasing in the sight of God, and must be taken as furnishing an example.[m] In this work, too, he still seems to keep pace with the Lutheran zealots in his hatred of Aristotle, whom he calls the apostle of Satan.[n]

He was at that time full of enthusiastic zeal for the cause of the Reformation; he believed himself to possess a certain gift of prophecy, and assured the Landgrave of a victory over the imperial army. Yet it was precisely the experience he acquired as military chaplain which led to the cooling of his zeal, and to his taking, by degrees, an opposite turn. Men of Thamer's character will always be found to pass over easily from one extreme to the other.

As there were many who had at first embraced the cause of the Reformation with enthusiasm, but who, when they found their exaggerated expectations not fulfilled—when a dark side met their view where they had expected nothing but light—became confounded with regard to the whole matter, because they did not know how to distinguish the principle and essence of the thing from that which was accidental, and disturbed by foreign admixture, in connection with its appearance: so was it also with Thamer. As the melancholy experience of George Wizel during the peasants' war wrought powerfully upon him, so was Thamer's mind impressed in like manner by that which he was compelled to see during the war of Schmalkald. So he himself at least declared, in an account which he gave[o] five years later, of the change

[k] He says of Athanasius: 'Contradicit enim sibi multoties in suis De Fuga commentariis et est quasi retrographus, dum carnales cogitationes et affectus corruptæ naturæ consectatur.'

[m] These are his words: 'Decepit autem te vana, nisi falsus sim, opinio vulgi, quod nugatur, omne quod factum est a sanctis, id Deo arridere et in exemplum trahendum esse.'

[n] His words are: 'Qua de re consule apostolum Satanæ, Aristotelem, aliasque ipsius creaturas.'

[o] See his work, *Wahrhaftiger Bericht von den Injurien und Lästerungen, welche ihm die Lutherischen deshalb falsch und unchristlich zumessen, dass er in den Glauben mit*

Digitized by Google

change that had taken place in himself in the mean time. The conduct of those who were anxious to fight for evangelical truth and freedom, seemed to him by no means to correspond to their professions. 'Good God!' he says, 'I saw that which made me shudder at heart, and found things very different from what I had hoped for; ay, altogether contrary to the name of the Gospel, on the defence of which they prided themselves; for they allege the love of God in opposition to his word and the Christian faith; they profess, on account of it, to be waging so dreadful a war, to which, nevertheless, the greater part are in reality led by nothing else than self-interest, vain glory, and fleshly lust. They feasted and caroused, they gambled and quarrelled, they blasphemed God in the highest degree, so that I believe the devil in hell could not invent more shocking execrations against God and his dear Son Christ; they robbed and plundered the poor people, our friends as well as our foes.' He felt it his duty, as he says, to preach by way of censure and admonition, but he found no hearing. Thus was he continually more and more prejudiced against the cause of the Reformation, and now he believed himself all at once to have discovered the root of all the evil in the Lutheran doctrine of justification, inasmuch as it led men to content themselves with mere faith, and to regard good works as unnecessary. He affirms that many whom he, as military chaplain, had reproved on account of their vicious course of life, had excused themselves in this way. 'They shot me,' he says, 'with my own arrow, replying, that everything depended exclusively upon faith; if it had been possible for us to be righteous in consequence of our works, why then was it necessary that Christ should die for us?'

Thus he returned, in a gloomy temper of mind, to Marburg, and was now inclined to look at everything he found amongst the Protestants on its darkest side. It was easy for him to become more and more confirmed in the position which he had once taken up, in opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of justification. In this mood he read the Bible anew; everything he met with was constrained to furnish him with proof, in connection with his new polemical tendency. Thus, for example, he sought to employ the evangelical narrative respecting the ten lepers[P] (Luke xvii.) against the Lutheran doctrine of justification. All the nine, he

mit guten Werken des Menschen Gerechtigkeit setzet,' 1552. (True Account of the injuries and calumnies which the Lutherans falsely and unchristianly deal out against him, because he places man's righteousness in faith accompanied by good works.)

[P] In the original, by a manifest error of the pen or the press, it is 'the ten *Samaritans.*'—Tr.

intimates,

Digitized by Google

intimates, had rendered faith, just as the Samaritan did; but faith was not enough—it was necessary that works should be superadded, as the case of the Samaritan shows. In this manner he declared his sentiments in sermons and public disputations. These assaults of his upon the main doctrine of the Evangelical Church necessarily attracted much attention, and gave rise to violent controversies, in which men of more moderate character also felt themselves constrained to take part. In the critical situation of the country during the absence of the Landgrave Philip, who was still a prisoner in the hands of the Emperor, this dissension, which had broken out in the national university, must needs appear all the more unfortunate. The government at Cassel interfered in the matter. Thamer was twice summoned thither, and an attempt was made to restore peace by means of an accord. In the midst of these negotiations, before Easter of the year 1548, he presented a Confession of Faith, which is important as containing the first expression of his altered convictions. We are able, even here, to discover *that* tendency which led him, through the path of opposition to the Lutheran doctrine of justification, to a one-sided magnification of the *ethical* element, to the *separation* of it from the dogmatical, and so by degrees to a *rationalistic* position.

'The true Son of God,' said he, 'the reflected brightness of his glory, is *virtue;* for the wise, righteous, kind, merciful God cannot produce anything else, from eternity, than wisdom, righteousness, love—or he would be no more the righteous, the wise, the merciful – if he wrought anything else, either in himself or out of himself in the creatures.' Virtue is also styled the mediator, through whom God created all things (John i.). This virtue is also called our reconciler, for no one can be reconciled to God except through love, wisdom, and the other virtues. It is also with propriety called the way (Ps. cxix.), for by it we come to God. It is called, finally, Jesus Christ our Lord, according to 1 Cor. i. 30, 'Christ, who is made unto us wisdom and righteousness.' In like manner he interprets the exhortation (Rom. xiii. 14), 'Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ;' that is, as he makes Paul explain himself in Col. iii., 'Put on . . . . compassion, kindness,' etc. Above all, it is love which the apostle John calls God —'God is love.' Inasmuch as Christ has revealed to us this virtue, and we are to clothe ourselves in it, it is called the Divinity of Christ, and we become thereby partakers of the Divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4), a temple of God, yea, even gods (John x. 34, 35). But in order that this virtue may be perfect in any one, two things are requisite—knowledge, and a life according to this knowledge; he who has imparted to us both is our Redeemer and

Digitized by Google

and Saviour, since he has delivered us from the ignorance of the soul and the infirmity of the body, that is, Jesus Christ, who is therefore styled by Paul 'the wisdom and power of God.' He has taught us, by words and works, the will of God and every kind of virtue, and has redeemed us, by means of knowledge, out of the kingdom of darkness. From Him also we receive power to work according to his divinity; for there is no one who gives the body power to work, except God. He, then, who through the divinity of Christ lives and works according to the example which he set as man, is called, on account of this behaviour, a child of God, a true member of Christ. In order to this it is also necessary that there should be a *material* upon which he is so to work—goods to be managed, the calling in which each has to engage, in which he is to make proof of his virtue (a remarkable allusion to the doctrine of *possessions*, which ought to form a part of the system of Christian ethics). He, then, as Thamer thinks, who conducts himself in the office intrusted to him according to the wisdom and strength which is given to each, and which, indeed, *is* Christ, is a believer, redeemed from sin by Jesus Christ. God descends to us by means of revelation, in which he makes known to us His will; we ascend to him by what is called faith. Faith, therefore, redeems us, redemption makes us perfect; perfection is the mediator with God, virtue is this mediator; from virtue, which labours for the glory of God, all has proceeded—it is also the means and the end. He who in this manner lives *of* God, *through* God, and *in* God, and continues in this life to the end, is orthodox.

He endeavours to point out a number of mistakes in the Lutheran system of doctrine, and the manner in which he does this, testifies to his wilfulness in the interpretation of the Scriptures, everything being compelled to bow to his own subjective conceptions. What Paul says against the justifying efficacy of the works of the law, is to be referred exclusively, in his opinion, to the *preparatory* stand-point of the laws of Moses and of nature, the stand-point of a eudæmonistic morality. 'God,' he says, 'now that the time is fulfilled, will not have us to be any longer disciples of Moses, will not have us any longer to work for the sake of the promised land or the interests of the belly:' true righteousness is to consist simply in this—to accomplish all we do to the honour of God and for the sake of everlasting life. He thinks, in the second place, that because the word πίστις sometimes means trust in God's mercy, they (the Lutheran theologians) had thence unfairly concluded that it was to be so understood wherever it occurred. He asserts, on the other hand, that in ch. xi. of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is designated a ὑπόστασις, *fundamentum*,

Digitized by Google

damentum, upon which a man may joyfully build, it is tantamount to 'doing God's will,' just as in Matt. vii. the fulfilment of the Divine will is the foundation upon which the house was erected. In the third place, he considers the word δωρεὰν ('freely') to have been misunderstood. He explains it, after his manner, as referring to the *use* of the *goods* which we have received; thereby are we justified. Fourthly, where it is said of Abraham that his faith was 'counted to him for righteousness,' this is to be understood as follows, 'Abraham *comprehended with the reason*, that such a life takes place to the glory of God, that this serves him and serves us all for righteousness;' for who does not comprehend with his reason that a servant cannot be called righteous before his master on account of the works which he does for the sake of his own interest (such as the works of the law), but that he who seeks to become righteous must render faith, and serve his master to his master's honour, as he has knowledge and ability? Nay, we all understand this, and cannot therefore be exculpated if we fail to serve God in so perfect a manner. But no one can comprehend how righteousness can be imputed by God to one who is a sinner; the contrary of which we all see,—for example, a thief does not become godly even though the righteousness of all the saints be imputed to him: he remains a thief afterwards, just as he was before, unless he himself change and becomes a godly man.

When he had presented this document, the chancellor laid before him a confession drawn up by the other party, which contained a full statement of the Lutheran doctrine of justification, and thereupon requested him to say what he had to find fault with in it. Thamer answered, 'They do not yet understand what Christ is.' Upon which the chancellor replied, 'What should Christ be? He is our Redeemer, who has made satisfaction for us and suffered in our stead.' Thus understood, Thamer would not allow the validity of the statement; he too admitted, indeed, a *satisfaction* accomplished by Christ on behalf of the human race; but, as a natural consequence of his doctrine of redemption already explained, he understood the expression in a totally different sense, and connected it merely with that which Christ accomplished by his *doctrine* and his *example*. 'He has by his humanity *done enough* with regard to *doctrine*, for there is none so learned but must nevertheless become his disciple; and on the other hand, there is none so ignorant as not to be able to learn from his example so much of the Divine will as may suffice for his salvation. For this reason God will not now send us any other Gospel nor suffer Christ to die again. He has died once, and therewith he has perfectly executed his office according to the flesh, so far as it is connected with the revelation of the Divine glory,

Digitized by Google

glory, and has also done enough for us all, in order to our redemption from ignorance. But as redemption by means of knowledge is not enough for the disciple, but there is required also a *life* according to knowledge and the employment of *art*, so also the redemption which has taken place through Christ is not enough for men, unless we henceforth through his other nature, that is, his divinity or the Holy Ghost, *serve* the doctrine with which we have become acquainted. Therefore Christ himself has said, "The flesh profiteth nothing." that is, in order to perfect redemption, which takes place only through the *life* or *spirit*, inasmuch as his humanity gives no life, nay, without the divinity it would itself be dead. And just for this reason, that we might not rest our whole redemption upon his humanity, he has taken it away from us, and sent his other nature, or the Holy Spirit, which leads us into all wisdom, which would be in vain if Christ's obedience accomplished in the flesh were designed to be altogether sufficient to us for righteousness.'

Although it is evident enough from these confessions of Thamer's how widely the tendency of his doctrinal belief departed from the formal and material principle of the Lutheran Church, yet an attempt was made to come to an understanding with him. He was dealt with more kindly than he would have been under any other government of that period. We discover in these proceedings, and in those which followed later, the influence of the principles of government adopted by Philip the Magnanimous, who, it is well known, distinguished himself from other Protestant princes by the encouragement of a greater liberty with regard to doctrine. Thamer was at last induced to give a pledge as to the manner in which he would propound the doctrine of justification by faith, which was also to satisfy his opponents. He was to profess that he would for the future teach and preach this article in the following manner—that faith in Jesus Christ saves and justifies without the works of the law; that the faith which is not active by love, and which does not bring forth good works, is a dead faith, yea, no faith at all, but only a semblance and name of faith. All this was to be merely provisional until the liberation of the Landgrave.

But after Thamer had returned to Marburg he began again to preach, more violently than ever, against the Lutheran Church and the cause of the Reformation. All the repeated attempts at a settlement of differences were frustrated by his violent passion, and it was at last perceived that peace could be again established and maintained only by removing him. In August of the year 1549 the decision was communicated to him, that until the return of the Landgrave Philip he was to refrain from all teaching in the

Digitized by Google

he schools and churches of the country (of Hesse-Cassel); in the mean time he was honourably dismissed with a present of fifty florins. He now thought of proceeding to the Netherlands to the captive Landgrave, and reporting the matter to him; but on the road he came into contact with some distinguished men of the Catholic party, from whom, as a violent enemy of the Evangelical Church, he met with a very favourable reception. They advised him to abandon his design, since he would certainly not be able to prevail, and to adopt another course in preference. By their advice he applied to the Archbishop of Mayence, who, it is true, received him with good will as an opponent of the Reformation, but declined to mix himself up further in the affair. Through the influence of this prelate he received an appointment at the close of the year 1549 as second preacher at the cathedral church of St. Bartholomew in Frankfort on the Maine.

Here, then, he made his appearance, in the midst of this zealously Lutheran city, as a violent opponent of Lutheranism and the Reformation, and a zealous champion of the Catholic Church. It must be admitted, at the same time, that he allowed himself to interpret Catholic doctrines and usages in just such a manner as might naturally be expected from his rationalistic mode of thinking, which became more and more evident. In his first sermon, on the Sunday after Christmas, he introduced, in an exposition of Gal. iv., his doctrine concerning the relation of the law to the Gospel, of which we have already given an account. He took occasion here, from the illustration which Paul has borrowed in that chapter from certain legal relationships, to say: 'To the pure all things are pure; let us then learn also from Paul how we must borrow examples out of every condition, in order to become acquainted with God's will. For truly there is nothing out of the church that has been created in vain; so that therefore Paul preached God's word even at idolatrous altars; Christ employs similitudes concerning thieves and usurers. How much more, then, is it true that within the Christian Church nothing has been instituted in vain?' And from these ceremonies also, which had been so long observed with great devoutness, one might become acquainted with that Christ and that Gospel which Paul had taught from the cases of the jurists and from idolatrous altars, especially since a preacher ought to be an imitator of Christ, who preached not merely with words of Scripture, but also, and to a much greater extent, from the works of God and of men, yea, who never taught or said anything without a parable (comp. Matt. xiii.). In accordance with this principle he proceeds to explain after his fashion the customs of the Catholic Church, in order to defend them against the attacks of the Protestants.

Digitized by Google

testants. Thus, for example, the priestly vestment: this signifies the pure doctrine and truth of God, with which the preacher ought to be clothed. 'It is assuredly true,' says he, 'that I never put on this garment without thinking within myself, "O Lord, give me thy grace and thy Spirit, that I may stand before thy face in the true white garment, and may not suffer any passion to slip into the pulpit along with me, that I may not soil this dress!" Let a man learn, either from the letter (of Scripture) or from other things, how he is to love God and to work righteousness, and he has learned rightly. All things are for good to those who love God (Rom. viii.) and are the Holy Scripture.' Of the stola he says that it signifies the mission (of the priest), that no one is to come of himself, but that every one ought to be sent by God and his church. Here he takes occasion to speak against the adherents of the Reformation. 'As, then, the fanatics,' he says, 'have cast away the stola, which signifies the true calling, it is therefore certain that they are not sent from God, but run of their own accord, as the prophet says, and lay everything waste like unruly swine.' Then, in a similar manner, he defends the repetition of the *Ave Maria*. Mary is, in his view, a symbol of the whole Christian Church. Outwardly, according to the letter, the expression, it may be, is a salutation which relates merely to Mary, the mother of God; but since the whole Scripture is to be understood spiritually, and is given for our sakes, this salutation relates not merely to Mary, but to us all, to whom the Christian Church also makes this prayer have reference. Praying, in the spiritual sense, is just nothing else than accomplishing the will of our Master in word and deed. If, then, a man prays in this spiritual sense, it follows necessarily that he also submits himself to the spiritual Mary, *i. e.* the Christian Church, which is signified by this outward Mary, and greets it in truth, *i. e.*, is prepared to do toward it all manner of good. The *Ave Maria*, then, spiritually interpreted, is to be taken as referring to true love towards all one's fellow-Christians. After having thus interpreted this expression by introducing into it an extraneous meaning, he proceeds thus: 'God knows, I cannot discover within myself whether any man could ask for himself anything higher or greater than if he should thus pray for his neighbours, "O fill these, I pray thee, with grace, and be with them." Inasmuch, then, as the *Ave Maria*, according to its spiritual signification, is a prayer which God spoke and instituted through the angel Gabriel, just as truly as he spoke and taught the *Pater Noster* through the humanity of Christ, it follows that Luther, who has petulantly, and to the scandal of many weak ones, cast out this prayer from the church of God as a piece of the

Digitized by Google

the greatest idolatry, does wrong, and has grappled fiercely and mistakenly with God Almighty.'

He used, when in the pulpit, not to *read* the text of the Gospels, but to *recite* it off hand. This circumstance, too, he interpreted so as to derive occasion from it for a taunt against Lutheranism, which he accused of a dead service of the letter. He did it, he said, because a true preacher of the Gospel ought not merely to *teach* the dead letter, but to *be*, by his works, prayers, and life, a Bible. 'But as they (the Lutherans) have their gospel only in their books, written with pen and ink, they teach with words a dead faith, and are in life unfruitful and corrupt.'

His absurd interpretations, which were intended to serve as a recommendation of Catholic doctrines and usages, could, however, in the midst of a zealous Lutheran city, excite nothing but derision; and he was, as he tells us, interrupted even in the church by open laughter, on account of which he thought it his duty to address a sermon of severe censure to those who had so conducted themselves in a sacred place. The circumstance increased his irritation, and he became all the more violent in his controversial sermons. He delivered a sermon against Luther's exposition of Gal. iii., in which he took occasion, from the distinction then made between the righteousness which avails before God and secular righteousness, to accuse Luther of introducing a total separation between religion and morality, of placing all religion in faith exclusively, of doing away with all its relations to the world and worldly circumstances — charges which were often uttered by such as did not perceive that the antithesis between *justitia spiritalis* and *civilis*, according to the meaning of the Reformers, has to do not with the *matter*, but with the *form* of action, the *disposition* from which everything ought to proceed; that the department which belongs to the *justitia civilis* is by no means excluded from that of the *justitia spiritalis*, but must be comprehended therein, just as also that relation to God which faith assumes, does not allow anything else to stand upon a level with it, but claims to be exclusively the determining principle for all human action and for all the circumstances of life. This misunderstanding with regard to the material principle of the Reformation explains how it was possible for Thamer to accuse Luther of anathematizing all the goods which God has granted to man in order to his own glorification. He says, for instance;—'Inasmuch as thou damnest these gifts or goods of God, which are granted to every one for a time in order that he may render faith (the *fidelity* of faith) therein, thou preachest no gospel, but deniest that Christ is come in the flesh, who became man solely far this purpose, that he might teach us all, every one according

Digitized by Google

to his understanding, how we ought to live to the glory of God, and to use these gifts aright through his divinity or the Holy Ghost. Thy doctrine is that no word or work belongs to the righteousness of God, or gives him the glory, but is merely intended to be useful to man here on earth, since God is honoured by bare faith. He who robs God of his goods which he has granted to us for a time for his own glory and our salvation, and of the fruits thereof, is a thief; and he who in like manner kills him his virtues, which are his only Son Jesus Christ, is a deicide, and, spiritually, murders Christ.'

Thamer fared amongst the Lutherans at Frankfort on the Maine just as George Wizel had done at Eisleben. He himself says, that frequently there were not so many as ten persons present to hear his sermons: and when he compared with this the concourse of hearers in which he had rejoiced at Marburg, it made, as he himself gives us to understand, so much the more painful an impression upon him, and his ill-temper increased in proportion. The Lutheran preachers heard of the abuse in which he had permitted himself to indulge in the pulpit against the Reformation, and controversial sermons preached by him, and taken down at the time, were also communicated to them. Thus there arose on both sides violent disputation, oral and written. The preacher Hartmann Bayer,[q] especially, came forward as an opponent of Thamer, and the latter, who was not slow to reply to him, was thereby led to a further development and defence of his principles in opposition to the Protestant point of view.[r]

From his own point of view, which was rationalistic, though concealing itself in mystical forms of expression, he attacked the formal and the material principle of Protestantism. He accused the Lutherans of deifying the letter of the Bible—an accusation to which it is likely that they gave frequent occasion by not distinguishing properly between the Word of God and the Holy Scripture; and he held up over against the *one* witness to which they continually and exclusively appealed, the other *two* witnesses, which it was necessary to have associated with the sacred Scrip-

[q] This Bayer was one of the class of zealous Lutherans, a friend of the well-known Hamburg preacher Joachim Westphal, with whom the renewal of the Eucharistic controversy began. See Languet's letter to Calvin of the date of March 15, 1558. 'Hartmannus Baier, concionator, qui est intimus Westphalo.'—Melanchth. epp. ed. Bretschneider, vol. ix. p. 484.

[r] Thamer's second work, composed after the one previously cited, *Das letzte Theil der Apologie gegen das Schandbuch Hartmann Bayer's; auch von den drei Zeugen, dem Gewissen, den Kreaturen und der heiligen Schrift, dass sie noch feststehen und wider alle Parten der Hölle bleiben werden.* 1552. (The last part of the Apology in reply to the scandalous book of Hartmann Bayer; also concerning the Three Witnesses, the Conscience, the Creatures, and the Holy Scripture, that they still stand firm and will endure against all the factions of Hell.)

Digitized by Google ture,

ture, conscience and the creatures (creation). 'If a man,' thus he addresses Luther, 'If a man asks of thee "Whence dost thou prove that these articles are the Gospel?" thou bringest forward a perverted witness, namely, the writing and the letter, which is painted upon the paper with ink, which in itself is as good as dumb, and answereth thee in a strange language which thou understandest not. Not only dost thou rate this human, yea Jewish and perverted mind higher than conscience, which is the revealed Godhead itself, and than all God's creatures or works, but thou also makest that (the Scripture) to be the queen of all the saints and angels in heaven.' He apprehends the formal principle of the Reformation with rugged, caricature-like exaggeration, in order to combat it the more easily. Thus he was able to say, 'If thou rejectest all service of God which takes place voluntarily on the part of men, without a scriptural command, thou rejectest the whole kingdom of Christ, in which we are to do nothing by compulsion of Scripture, but everything according to that which God has given to each of us. Show me a passage in which it is prescribed, "At this time give alms; at this time relieve the sick; at this, eat or drink."' He maintains that 'a thing is not true because it is to be found in the Bible; but it is in the Bible because it is in itself true. The Bible cannot be in contradiction to the truth as it reveals itself in conscience and in the creatures; but, on the contrary, it presupposes the latter. 'Thou sayest,' addressing his opponent, 'that the Scripture may be true although it has no testimony from conscience or the creatures. That is quite impossible. It amounts properly to a denial, or even an abolition of the Sacred Scripture: for tell me, good friend, *wherefore* is that true which Moses writes about the creation, and also other histories? Are these accounts true *because* he *wrote* as he did, or is it the truth because the creatures were *actually* so *created*, and because we can comprehend with our conscience that the event did so take place? Truly thou must admit that what Moses writes, or what the prophets preach, is true not because *they* have so *written*, but because *it* so *happened*. And if, according to the testimony of the creatures or of conscience, it had happened *otherwise*, the writings of Moses and the prophets would be not merely no witnesses at all, but a lying and false witness.'

Thus the Sacred Scripture passes with him merely for a witness of the truth which reveals itself in the conscience and in the creation generally; in connection with which view it is of no consequence *from whom* these Scriptures originated. 'It has nothing to do with the matter, how holy the authors of these writings may have been. Even if Christ himself had written anything,

Digitized by Google

thing, according to the flesh, it would not have been at all holier or better than as if any other man had written it. Though Peter (Acts iii.) by the power of the Holy Ghost made a lame man whole, the latter did not, surely, thereby become holy or righteous in the sight of God. It was of no more avail to him in this respect, than as if he had been cured by any other physician. On the contrary, in order to become righteous before God, it was necessary that he should first learn inwardly, in his conscience, to understand the will of God, and then live accordingly. In like manner the writings of the prophets and apostles are not better than other writings merely because they were written by such men under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Writing is but writing, let whoever will be the writer. The impulse of the Spirit which was in Peter or Paul does not make any outward work or writing holy; but the knowledge and understanding which each obtains in his own way, even through the self-same Spirit, this is for us the Sacred Scripture, if we live accordingly, and bring forth fruit to God.' He charges his opponents with entertaining a crass, carnal notion of inspiration. 'They conceived of it in no other way than that God sat somewhere with a grizzly beard, just as the painters draw him on the wall, and took up with his hand a word, *i. e.* a sound, and laid it on the tongue of a Jeremiah,' etc.

Thamer declared *conscience* to be the first and most essential of the three witnesses; that, without which, all other revelation and instruction could help a man nothing. He applies this notion, however, in a rather wavering manner, referring it sometimes to the moral, sometimes to the intellectual, understanding by it the *reason* generally. It is worthy of note how the *rationalistic* element, which according to its very nature must strive in the direction of the *pantheistic*, in which it first finds its perfect logical development, approximates to this even with him. 'Conscience,' says he, 'which is the Godhead and Christ himself now dwelling in our hearts, understands and judges what is evil and what is good. The letter, which is without us, cannot give testimony concerning the truth within us, apart from the conscience, which fulfils it and makes it true. It (the letter) merely teaches in the congregation, "Love God with all the heart and with all the soul." But that thou knowest *what* the Lord is, what soul, mind, and strength are, as also how much thou hast, and how much thou art bound to serve God, this must every one's conscience' (which notion, therefore, here passes over into that of the *reason*) 'testify and inwardly preach to him. Supposing that Scripture and the creatures existed, yet, without conscience, we should know just as little about the truth as an irrational animal, which even now

Digitized by Google

now exists along with the Sacred Scripture, and the creation, aye, lives therein, and yet does not possess the truth.' 'Conscience,' he says, 'is Jesus Christ himself, and whoever rejects this is the Antichrist that sets himself above God and the revealed Godhead.' In the declaration of the Johannean Gospel respecting Christ—that 'he knew what was in man,' Thamer finds a reference to the conscience, which he identifies with Christ. Just as he universally manifests a disposition to mingle and to confound heterogeneous notions, to content himself with what is *half* true and to apply it as if it were *all* the truth, so he appeals, in support of his ambiguous doctrine of conscience, to the words of Christ (John ix.), that he was 'come into the world for judgment,' in which, certainly, the existence of a conscience in man is *presupposed;* but this is not itself the subject-matter of discourse. He makes the passage refer to the judgment of conscience. This gives testimony to every man, and where any one acts in opposition to it, he sins against the divinity of Christ or the Holy Spirit. 'Conscience,' he maintains, 'is the true, living throne of grace, where we ask God how and what we shall do or allow, where we are also to answer and to learn what is yet concealed. Out of this there is no grace, nor does God preach to thee without this; which is so true, that even if a man were to hear the outward Scripture read, or even to hear Christ himself in the flesh preaching his Gospel with his own mouth for a thousand years, and yet had not inwardly the living word, the divinity of Christ, the conscience, it would be no word at all to him.'

His opponent, Hartmann Bayer, had been scandalized at Thamer's calling the conscience '*Deus revelatus.*' He, however, defends this appellation, saying, 'That which is not communicated to us by our parents in our birth, but is every day wonderfully given or infused into us both in body and soul from without, without the help of any creature, yea even without our own knowledge, must *be somewhere before* it is given or infused into us; and it cannot be a creature. But everything that has a being and yet is not created, must be God; since there does not exist, either in heaven or upon earth, anything that lies in the middle (between these two). The understanding in the soul and the strength in the body are not created or born in us, and do not arise in us by the same kind of means, but God gives or infuses them into us just as he will.' He appeals to the words of the apostle Paul (1 Cor. xii.), 'Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?' 'Of what else is this said, than of the understanding and the strength which have in the soul and the body merely their lodging-place? (Acts xvii.) "In him we live, and move, and have our being."' Which words

Digitized by Google

words also (according to Thamer) contain a formal reference to these two objects, 'since we all live, and likewise move, by means of understanding and strength. But as the Godhead is unchangeable, let it be where it will, so they are always like it, and are the Godhead. Therefore also understanding and strength are absolutely good, and they abide in their essential nature, whether we use this divinity rightly or wrongly. Conscience, which is the Godhead or the Holy Ghost, can no more be defiled by abuse than gold, if lying in the mud, will cease to be gold. It still continues to be the Godhead, so long as it is there.' When he was met with the objection that every one appealed to conscience —he who hoped to obtain forgiveness of his sins by circumcision, and he who sought to it by means of his offerings—he replied, 'May we not say the very same thing of thy perverted Scriptures, that there are hardly six or seven in Frankfort on the Maine who expound them in the same way? Which none will ever be able to say concerning conscience, for all consciences accorded in the utterance, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."'

As we have before said, he names as the second witness the *creatures* (creation) in which God reveals himself. Scripture everywhere points to the creatures. 'If thou dost examine the whole Scripture, from the first page to the last, thou wilt find nothing else than a history of the creatures, which we understand by means of conscience or knowledge, and learn to regulate our life accordingly.' He appeals to the *parables*, *e. g.*, that of the mustard seed. 'If thou didst not *see* this to be so in the creatures themselves, wouldst thou be persuaded of it in the Scripture?' 'Although Christ says, "Go and teach all nations" (the same Gospel which is preached by all the creatures), he does not intend by these words, as thou understandest, to impose upon people new *dogmata* which are not in the conscience, or which are contrary to it, but he means to remind us of that which is revealed in his creatures or works from the beginning.' In like manner, according to his arbitrary method of exposition, with which, certainly, he could make out of the Sacred Scripture any and everything, he renders Mark xvi. 15, πασῃ τῃ κτίσει, 'by every creature,'—or, as he makes Paul explain it, Col. i. 23, 'Preach the Gospel, which is already preached in all the creatures that are under heaven.' 'Inasmuch as you,' he says, 'like the Manichæans, anathematize nature, you anathematize, properly speaking, the word of God, aye, God himself, so far as he has revealed himself to us, and substitute an idol, the dead and perverted letter.' He emphatically declares his opposition to that rude view of nature and of man's relation to it, which represents it

Digitized by Google

it as intended to serve merely for the gratification of his sensual necessities, and man's dominion over it as having relation merely to his use of them for *this* purpose. He calls it 'a great blasphemy against God to say that the creatures were brought into existence for the sake of man's belly; rather, on the contrary, were they created for the glory of God, that through them man might perceive God in his glory, and might learn to glorify God in them. There is nothing upon earth that is not an element and introduction to true faith, or that does not preach God's glory. The creatures are presented to man for a visible, just as the Sacred Scriptures for an audible word; for if the creatures taught us nothing unto salvation, but only unto this life, as you allege, they would be not only useless, but also subject to sin, and would augment the kingdom of the devil.'

In addition to these two witnesses, in which every man has in himself what is sufficient for him, God, out of his superabounding goodness, gives to the Jews a third, which is the Scripture or the law of Moses. This is rather a memorial of, and index to, the two former, than itself a distinct witness; for God in a wonderful manner awakens within us the conscience, and then forms it by means of his works and creatures, which he has also marvellously created, and still upholds in their proper condition. Therefore also are these called the proper God-witnesses, because they are sent *immediately* from God; for no angel or devil can make man a conscience or an understanding,—but only God, the creator of heaven and earth. But this third witness, Scripture, which is come to us out of the superabundance of God's goodness, has been given by God in a *mediate* way (by the employment of means through the mediation of men). Therefore is it called the law of *Moses*, to mark this distinction. Though this also proceeds from God; just as arts and handicrafts which are exercised by men, in like manner proceed from God too. 'For, indeed, we no more have from ourselves the outward arts and ordinances which serve for this life than Moses had the law from himself. As the Jews had the letter and ceremonies along with the two former witnesses, so are art and handicraft given to us heathen (Gentiles) for a more complete testimony. And truly these witnesses, which we call a work of man, are just directed towards the creatures or works of God, even as the Scripture rests upon the same; for as an art is better and more masterly the nearer it is to nature, so also is Scripture more certain and intelligible the more it harmonizes with creation.' He seeks for the revelation of God through the conscience amongst the heathen also; and now praises Aristotle, whom, from his earlier point of view, he had so greatly depreciated, 'I should like to know whether a man

Digitized by Google

a man might not just as well derive an argument from the wisdom, righteousness, and other virtues which Aristotle describes, and just as well take them into his mind, as Paul the idolatrous altar. Thinkest thou not that Aristotle, in his generation, received from God his skill for the edification of the Christian Church, just as much as Paul and Peter did in theirs? Must not one have wood and stone in order to the completeness of the temple, as well as silver, gold, and jewels? Are there not in a great house, such as God's house is, manifold vessels and singular arts, which nevertheless are all of service to their Lord? Or thinkest thou that Aristotle had such wisdom from nature, that is from himself, without God? Surely, even Aristotle, that learned man, will not have written so beautiful a book concerning virtues and vices, without the impulse and spirit of God. Laugh thou and deride me as thou wilt, I will learn more out of Aristotle than the whole world is able to learn out of Luther's perverted German Bible.'

He distinguishes a twofold stand-point: the stand-point of the law and of nature—to show love to one's neighbour, to do good, for the sake of an earthly object; and the stand-point on which this takes place from love to God, in order to his glory—the spiritual conscience, the Christian stand-point, which, however, according to his view, could hardly be one that necessarily required the intervention of the historical Christ for its attainment. 'Where a man,' he says, 'serves God and his neighbour as God wills that one should serve him, for the sake of temporal honour, or of the land of Canaan, and has not yet a perception of that which is everlasting, he is, according to the righteousness of the law of Moses or of nature, irreprehensible, and possesses the *spiritual Scripture* of the Old Testament. But if a man serves God and his neighbour for the sake of God's glory and of eternal life, then is this saying of Christ, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them," for him the New Testament, or living word, which is written not with pen and ink, but with the Holy Ghost, or by the Godhead, in his heart, and it will also abide for ever. Even after the judgment will this saying be in us the Holy Scripture, whether we be saved or condemned.'

His opponent, Bayer, had maintained that Christ makes reference only to the Sacred Scripture, to that which he had foresaid by Moses or the prophets. He, on the contrary, insists: 'I think it possible that I will show thee, any day, ten parables and doctrines which Christ employs, taken from the creatures, before thou canst show me one saying out of Moses and the prophets. Still darest thou thus sell spectacles to simple people, and shamefully deceive them, as if Christ commanded us to look only at the Scripture, and forbade us to contemplate his creatures, which we cannot

Digitized by Google

cannot dispense with either spiritally or bodily? He spake nothing without a parable, as Matthew testifies. Does he not refer thee to the birds of the heaven and the lilies in the fields, just as truly as to Moses or the Scripture? 'But how,' he then goes on to say, 'how if these very prophets that testify of Christ should be just the virtues written in the conscience? Verily, Christ tells us that this understanding or this conscience, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye the like to them," is the law and the prophets; for a prophet is one who speaks things which are to come. Thy conscience, or the truth in thy conscience, prophetizes unto thee, that if thou dost not serve God thy Lord as thou hast power or opportunity, thou shalt be punished; and again, that if thou doest this, thou shalt also receive the reward.'

Thamer's antagonist appealed to the fact that one does not, at any rate, find anything in the conscience about Christ, the Son of God, the Trinity, Christ's being born of the Virgin, or about redemption. He, however, seeks, in reply, to show that all these articles of faith are only indications of certain undeniable truths of the reason. 'I ask thee, in the first place,' he says to him, 'whether thou supposest that God has a son just in the same way that father and mother produce a son; or that, on the contrary, it is to be understood in a spiritual sense, as Christ himself says (Matt. xii. 48); for Christ is the righteousness, wisdom, and every virtue of God. Now whoever does what is right gives birth to righteousness, that is Christ, spiritually. Since, then, the just and wise God always works rightly and wisely, he must surely from eternity give birth to this Son, that is, righteousness and wisdom—a doctrine which is taught by reason just as much as it is by Scripture. When, therefore, God, the wise and righteous one, reveals his wisdom and righteousness in works, these works are with propriety called his offspring, or his son. And this in a twofold manner; for he who is wise and righteous first gives birth to wisdom and righteousness in himself in thoughts, after which virtues, as after a pattern, he then creates the outward work. Reason, therefore understands thus *how* Christ, that is the eternal wisdom and righteousness, *is*, and is, moreover, also truly *man*—in whom, inasmuch as he is created after the (likeness of) the eternal wisdom and righteousness and all the virtues which *are* God, the entire fulness of the Godhead must dwell, which none but he can reveal in both these natures, because thus the eternal wisdom and righteousness appear in these works.' In like manner he interprets the doctrine that Christ is the only begotten Son of God, God and man in one person, as signifying that God's wisdom and righteousness are revealed in Christ's humanity, that Christ has

Digitized by Google

has given the most perfect example of virtue. He then endeavours to prove the necessity of a redemption as founded in the reason or the conscience:—'But since one who is wise creates nothing in vain, neither gives his glory to another, it follows irrevocably that God must redeem the human race, which he created alone after his image, otherwise he would lose the glory of his wisdom, as being one who had created not merely *something*, but the *highest* creature, man, in vain. This redemption cannot be effected otherwise than through Christ, who is truly God and truly man; for if God is to be worshipped in truth and perfectly venerated by us, he must by the revelation of his wisdom make us competent thereunto, and this takes place by means of that work or creature which is the most perfect—that is the *humanity* of Christ, whereby the inward man is redeemed from the darkness of ignorance—and then the *power* to act according to the will of God, as known from the example which Christ gave, through his divinity or the Holy Spirit.' The birth of Christ by a virgin is explained by him in such a manner that nothing at all of faith in the supernatural fact is to be found in his interpretation. 'Christ, the wisdom and righteousness of God, cannot be conceived* otherwise than through the Holy Ghost or the power of God; for how can God communicate wisdom and power in order that thou mayest bring forth fruit unto him, otherwise than by his own power or omnipotence?—which is indeed his Spirit that makes thee apt and spiritually pregnant unto such service of God. Further, inasmuch as wisdom and righteousness cannot dwell along with folly and sin, it follows also that such an one must be chaste and without sin. Now he who is not befouled with sin is even as a chaste virgin. Therefore, also, Christ, that is wisdom and righteousness, must be born of a virgin, *i. e.* of such a one as sins not in anything; otherwise, if he yet sinned, he would immediately cease to bear righteousness.' After having thus interpreted the peculiar doctrines of Christianity as mere symbols of his ethical rationalism, he might well add—'Let this be briefly answered to thee; I hope, too, that we understand well how these articles may and ought to be understood by the conscience of our reason, supposing that we had no Scripture, even as the ancient patriarchs, before the Scripture (was given), saw and recognized the day or the light of the Lord, just as truly as we who have the written book of the Gospels.'

Thamer was a most zealous opponent of the Lutheran doctrine of hereditary depravity, which he calls a kind of Manichæism.

* The German word here employed is equivocal, meaning both '*con*ceived' in the *special* sense, and also '*re*ceived' in the *general* sense.—Tr.

He

Digitized by Google

He understands by hereditary depravity nothing else than, as he expresses it, the darkness of a defective understanding and the weakness of the body; and his notion of redemption also, of which we have spoken already, must necessarily shape itself accordingly.

He opposes with great violence the doctrine of the Church concerning Satisfaction, and the Lutheran doctrine of Justification. 'How can one,' says he, in opposition to the former, 'conceive of a more perverse doctrine than this is? No greater sin was ever committed than the murder of God's own Son, and thou wilt have this greatest sin imputed to thee for righteousness; is not this a great piece of folly? Christ did not die in order that either his death or his resurrection might be imputed to thee or to me for righteousness, but in order that he might by this sacrament reveal the greatest righteousness and the greatest sin. By means of this sin the greatest sin is perceived, in order that we might henceforth avoid it. By means of his resurrection hath appeared, on the other hand, the greatest righteousness, in which we who live after his example, are also risen, and are truly Christian people. The flesh or the humanity of Christ serves only for doctrine and knowledge of the will of God—for prosperity or life it is of no use. But if thou, by means of such doctrine, labourest to the glory of God, then his (Christ's) divinity or spirit makes (thee) alive, when thou also henceforth yieldest obedience to the Father, or bearest thy cross, or performest thy duty, even unto death, as Christ hath preceded thee and accomplished his duty. Thus art thou justified.' The historical Christ, who serves merely for doctrine and for example, has for him but a limited significancy. Everything, according to his doctrine, depends upon the divinity of Christ, which fits us to act as Christ has taught us by word and example, upon the activity of the Holy Ghost in us, the spiritual humanity of Christ, we being his members—the Christ in us or the spiritual conscience—which are merely different expressions of the same notion; and it becomes evident how his doctrine tended to make the historical Christ altogether superfluous by reason of the self-sufficiency of the conscience, and to substitute in place of him the conscience as the proper redeeming principle. From this point of view he could say, 'When Moses (Deut. xviii.) promises a prophet to come, this is not to be understood exclusively of the outward humanity of Christ, which reveals to us the will of God, and is of no further use, and has therefore also been taken away from us; but it is to be spiritually interpreted of the spiritual humanity of Christ, that is, ourselves or our conscience.' 'We can understand and perceive from this what is our duty to God much better than from all the things which are

Digitized by Google

are external to us, be they what they will, even Christ's own words or history, of which the letter speaks, which many cannot understand, many cannot read, many can neither understand nor read.' 'Our humanity or conscience teaches us inwardly, in the heart, is moreover continually present with us, as a faithful schoolmaster. Thus Moses teaches by the outward word or figure, is not always with us, yea, cannot lead us into the promised land: on the contrary, the only true Joshua is our humanity, which is Christ. Whatever else has to do with the outward humanity of Christ, or even his spoken word, yea, even the history, gospel, and miracles which he accomplished in the flesh, do not distinguish him from Moses. But it is for us a breath (a *mere* breath, merely a word uttered forth into the air) or letter, just as truly as the other; and as Moses's doctrine is dead, apart from the understanding and conscience—for he can only give us words, not make us understand them—so also Christ teaches and sows the seed, so far as he is man. Therefore if we do not advance beyond (an acquaintance with) the outward humanity of Christ, we are still with Moses in the Old Testament, and have not yet received the Holy Spirit, or his divinity, which is the New Testament. But just as it was necessary for Christ, as to his humanity, to go away, since otherwise the Comforter would not have come, so also must our understanding cease from the outward Christ, and must become acquainted with the inward Christ, *i. e.*, that we should do to others as we would have them do to us. Whoever perfectly understands this in him Christ dwells; he has also the word of God, or, as Christ calls it, the law and the prophets.' 'The letter, or the humanity of Christ, is like a direction-post, which shows the pilgrim the way into the city to which he wishes to go. Conscience, that is, the old conscience of the pre-Christian stand-point, may be likened to that foot-traveller, in so far as it is directed by Christ's humanity to the city to which it is to go; which city is God's glory and Christ's divinity, for thence we all come (it is our *destiny*, inasmuch as we are created for the glory of God), and thither must we all again.' He means to say, therefore—By contemplating the doctrine and the example of Christ we learn that it is our destiny to live to the glory of God, to do towards others, for God's sake, as we wish them to do towards us, to which we are rendered competent by the power of God dwelling in us. By this means the development of the natural conscience into the spiritual is effected. 'The letter,' says he, 'serves as a memento that we do not from carelessness forget the way which creation and conscience have taught us. And as the said foot-traveller, when he is come into the city which he was at first seeking with joy abides therein, and occupies himself in his calling,

Digitized by Google

calling, so when any one lives henceforth to the glory of God, is he also in the city whither he ought to go, in the spiritual Jerusalem, and has peace and joy in his heart, as one who is in his fatherland, and sits, so far as the said knowledge is concerned, with Christ at the right hand of God.

How this ethical rationalism tended to evaporate everything historical in connection with religion, may be perceived from these remarkable words of Thamer's: 'The spiritual sense is, that we should no longer think of the outward creation of the earthly paradise, of the Noahic deluge, etc., of the outward prophets, of the outward birth, conduct, miracles, suffering, death, and resurrection of Christ. We ought, on the contrary, to be dead to all this, and to contemplate only the new creation, the eternal paradise, the spiritual fall and disobedience, the true deluge, the being baptized in Christ or dying to sin, the inward circumcision, the law of Christ written in our hearts, the spiritual kingdom, the inward prophets or virtues which God sends by means of the conscience. As the sum of all: by water and spirit we are to be born anew, we are ourselves to do good works, suffer, die, and rise again from sins, ascend to heaven and sit at the right hand of Christ; then have we spiritually understood the Scripture.'

Man, therefore, carries within himself the source of all truth in his conscience; all instruction can serve but to excite that which is in him, so that he may become conscious to himself of the truth that dwells in his conscience. To the question, 'But of what use, then, are Scripture and preaching, if everything is contained in the conscience already?' Thamer replies: 'The heart of man is like a flint, in which the fire is beforehand; thou needest not to *bring* it thereto, nay, thou *canst* not: but thou *strikest out* that which was in it before. Thus also the preacher has merely to strike out the fire, the spirit, which is within; not, like Nadab and Abihu, to bring new fire into the sanctuary—God does not tolerate that.'

It was very easy for him to appropriate for his rationalistic stand-point the Catholic principle of the authority of the Church. He beholds in the tradition of the Church merely the development of the Christian spirit divesting itself of the covering of the letter,—the *minting* of the reason or conscience (which according to his doctrine is identical with the Christ in us, the divinity of Christ, the Holy Spirit) in definite symbols. We have seen already how he contrived to interpret the *customs* of the Church in accordance with his rationalistic point of view.

He reckons himself amongst those godly teachers 'who rate the Christian Church, *i. e.* the understanding or conscience of Christians,

Digitized by Google

tians,[t] higher than the carnal sense of Scripture.' Since it was customary from the Catholic stand-point to urge in favour of the authority of the Church that it is the testimony of the Church by which we are first directed to Christ and the Sacred Scripture. Thamer's opponent, Bayer, had objected in reply that he who gives testimony does not by any means need to be of higher rank than the person of whom he testifies, as may be shown from the relation of John the Baptist to Christ. To this Thamer replied: 'O mighty argument! Is the Christian Church merely a witness of Christ, or is it his spiritual body, and are we all his members? Verily, Paul testifies that it is Christ's body. If then the Church is the body of Christ, it must be himself, and whosoever honours or dishonours it has done the same thing to him also. So Acts x. 'Saul, why persecutest thou me?' In which case, surely, Saul could not persecute him according to the flesh, because he had ascended to heaven; but only the Church, or his spiritual members. Thou, too—what art thou else than thy body and thy members? Verily, whosoever woundeth thee in the hand, of him we say that he has wounded Hartmann. Well, now, is Christ Lord of the Scripture or not? If he is, then must the Church also, as his body, have a supremacy over the Scripture by virtue of the Holy Spirit; for she is the Church, just in so far as she has the Spirit of Christ, and this latter is above the Scripture. Therefore it avails nothing to cite the case of John the Baptist, who cannot be Lord over Christ in the same manner as the Christian Church is a lady or queen over the Scripture, which is given only for her sake. So that if she had not *been*, God, also, would never have given the Scripture, neither would he have sent Moses or any outward prophets. As, then, Christ says that man is more than the Sabbath, which stands in the Scripture and was instituted on man's account, so also may I conclude concerning the Scripture that it is subject to the Church, because for her sake it was given and is called holy.'

Although Thamer thus played the champion for the interest of the Romish Church, interpreted according to his views, yet he could not find acceptance with the canons in Frankfort for any great length of time. They called him a phantast: he lost his appointment there, again, becoming obnoxious, at the same time to both parties. Meanwhile, the liberty of Germany had been gained in conflict by the Elector Maurice of Saxony, and the Landgrave Philip, having been delivered from his imprisonment, had also returned into his territories. To him Thamer made appli-

[t] Just as in another place he calls the spiritual conscience, which he opposes to the conscience of the natural or legal stand-point in the manner already explained, the *sense of the Christian Church.*

cation

Digitized by Google

cation in a letter written January 27, 1553. He complained of the injustice which he had experienced on both sides, and offered to defend himself before an assembly of learned men. He transmitted to the Landgrave his two works from which we have derived the previous summary of his doctrine, in order that he might understand from them what his views were.[a]

The Landgrave replied[x] to him on the 4th of February in the same year, in a letter which was written in a spirit of great gentleness. In this letter he gave him assurance of his sympathy, but at the same time testified to him, with that independence of judgment with which he had been accustomed from his twentieth year to give account of his religious conviction,[y] his dissatisfaction with the sentiments he had expressed, and with the whole of his previous conduct. 'As for conscience,' he wrote to him, 'it is indeed true that every man has this judge inwardly present with him, and that the man who has a good conscience can serve God joyfully; nevertheless one must not confound conscience with the Holy Ghost or God himself, it being rather a work or working of God in man. As for the creatures, a strong understanding may, likely enough, derive some great truths from the contemplation of them; but surely it is for the simple much easier and better to derive their instruction from the outward word, which God has given for that purpose.' In a postscript he pointed out to Thamer's attention the fact that the most important articles of doctrine contained in the Sacred Scripture, for example those concerning the creation, and the life everlasting, could not be deduced from Aristotle, but that the contrary of these doctrines, rather, was to be found in his writings. In order that he might not put too much confidence in his own intellect, he reminded him of two false prophecies of which he had been the author; the one, that which we have mentioned already, concerning the prosperous issue of the war of Schmalkald; the other, which Thamer's hatred against the Reformation had dictated to him subsequently, that the Landgrave would not be released from his captivity until Lutheranism should have been wholly extirpated, the contrary of which was now in like manner plainly before his eyes.

[a] The copy which Thamer sent to the Landgrave is in the library at Cassel. It is bound in thin parchment, and on the parchment cover are these words, in Thamer's handwriting: 'People generally cover with velvet the books which are sent to princes, and bind them in the most costly manner; which I have omitted to do. But still I hope my little book is clothed in truth, and most studiously bound together with love, which is the bond of perfectness. Your princely Grace will therefore have patience with my poverty.'

[x] See the article 'Thamer' in Strieder's *Hessischer Gelehrtengeschichte*, bd. xvi. s. 145, u. d. f.

[y] See some of the first amongst the letters of the Landgrave, published by Rommel in the third volume of his work.

Digitized by Google

Thamer then wrote to the Landgrave a second letter in defence of himself, in which, amongst other things, he says: 'Although the creatures or animals cannot talk as we do, yet I am sure that your princely Grace oftentimes understands the whining of horses and dogs, which is their language, better than when anybody reads Hebrew or Greek out of the Scripture.' The Landgrave replied to him in a letter of March 4, 1553, in which he defended against him with much warmth and great ability the principles from which the Reformation had proceeded, and pointed out to him the untenableness of the ideas he had put forth with regard to the creatures, and the forcedness of his expositions of the Bible. 'We are very far,' he wrote, 'from rejecting the good conscience of man, for we know well what John and Paul say about it, and an excellent thing it is when a man's heart and conscience frees (acquits), and does not accuse him, as John the Evangelist says in his Epistle; yet always (supposing that this takes place) not according to his own dreams and fancies, but according to the contents of the divine word. That conscience, which is a creature, and is in man, is the revealed Godhead and Christ himself, cannot be; for conscience is our spirit, the Holy Spirit is another thing, as Paul clearly teaches in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, whom we more believe than we do your allegory. In that you write again about the creatures, and give yourself a great deal of trouble to learn as much from them as from the written word of God, we do not agree with you at all, and the saying of Paul, Col. i., avails not for such a purpose. Although he says, "which is preached among all creatures that are under heaven," he does not say that the *creatures* are to be preached, but the *Gospel*, which *is* preached among all creatures that are under heaven."' And he appeals to the comparison with Col. i. 23.[a] 'It is true, as we wrote, that the creatures do not talk, and also that we learn more from the oral and perused word than from the creatures. Though it may be true that some men of understanding learn much from the creatures also, yet, speaking generally, it will be a rare thing indeed to find a peasant who looks at cats and other animals to learn God's will from them; much less one who can by reflection derive from them God's commandments; much less still one who can derive from them (a knowledge of) the resurrection of the dead, the last judgment, the Trinity, *One* God, and the like, or that Christ has suffered and risen again for us.' 'So will you never learn from the sun and moon and stars that God made

[a] This is the very passage which has just been quoted. Probably it is a misprint (of which the pamphlet contains several other examples) for Col. i. 6.—Tr.

heaven

Digitized by Google

heaven and earth by his Word, nor that heaven, sun, moon, stars, and earth will be dissolved again; for the sun and moon rise and set, by day and night, one year like another. Where is the man that will learn from these things—if he has not the oral and written word—that God made them, and that they have not been eternally, or that they will be dissolved again? From this perceive your error, and learn that the creature is not of equal rank with the outward word, as regards the instruction of men in these things.' 'But we are seized with wonder that all sects bluster so horribly—that they would be glad to get rid of the outward word; we can conceive of no other cause than that they held it beforehand as of small account, and wished to invent, one his dream, another a revelation, a third an allegory—to break forth in a manner not conformable to the Scripture (which is intended to be the proper standard) and so to mislead people. We say verily these are thoughts which Satan inspires, against which we ought to pray to God and to take good heed to ourselves.' The Landgrave, in declaring himself opposed to Thamer's forced interpretations of Scripture, reminded him that he had already, at an earlier period, testified to him his dissatisfaction at the excess of allegorizing which was to be found in his sermons. 'You knew our mind a long time ago, that nothing was so unpleasant to us in your sermons as your doing nothing but occupying yourself constantly with allegories, just as you do here also. We allow to allegories their worth in some things, but we shall not accept them as evidence in these great matters, where there are not clear declarations of Holy Scripture.' The Landgrave insisted upon it that the will of God must be learned from the Bible rather than from Aristotle. When Thamer appealed to the circumstance that the Apostle Paul had quoted the words of Aratus and Menander, he replies to him, 'That has a very different aspect from what it has with you. Paul speaks thus to the heathen, who were not yet Christians, and does so not many times. But you speak to those who have already heard of Christ and been baptized, and yet seek to prove (your statements) by the help of the heathen philosophers, which you might do much better from the Sacred Scriptures. Nor will you often find that Paul sought to prove the truth of the Gospel to those who were Christians by arguments drawn from philosophy. You, on the other hand, constantly enforce your preaching with allegories and creatures out of the philosophy of Aristotle, so that the greater part of your hearers are sick and tired of it.' 'And verily,' he writes to him, 'your book contains a bold speech, in that you write, you would not esteem any article of our faith correct if you could not find it in your conscience and reason; you will never

Digitized by Google

never comprehend by the force of your reason how God created heaven and earth out of nothing, how Christ was born of Mary, wherefore he is God and yet hath so humbled himself,—*item*, how the body of man, after having been wasted, burnt, separated into many pieces, shall rise again. You will see these articles (of faith) neither in reason, nor in Aristotle, nor in cats and dogs, nor in sun and moon, but must learn them from the Scripture and the oral word, through the working of the Holy Ghost.' He agreed with him in this, that Luther had been too violent as a polemic, and had fallen into exaggerations, just as Thamer himself, however, had done in his controversy with Hartmann Bayer. 'But in so far as he taught without contention, he did indeed teach faith, love, hope, and good works after a masterly and Christian manner. Do not so altogether despise the good Luther and his friends, for if you had not been at Wittenberg, you would not know, nor have by inspiration, the things with which you are now acquainted.'[a]

But, greatly as the Landgrave Philip, by reason of a firmly-established conviction arising from personal investigation and inward experience, disapproved Thamer's peculiar sentiments, he nevertheless behaved towards him with the greatest mildness and forbearance, because he respected his otherwise blameless life, his scientific culture, and his sincere though misdirected zeal. It was his earnest wish to reclaim him from his errors by working upon his conviction, and to win him back again for the service of the Evangelical Church. As Thamer had declared himself ready to engage in a disputation with theologians of other countries, the Landgrave was willing to try whether their influence was capable of producing any change in his views; and he spared neither trouble nor expense in connection with this object. In the year 1553 he caused Thamer to travel to Jena, Wittenberg, Dresden, and Zürich, accompanied by a Hessian ambassador, in order that the most eminent theologians of the Evangelical Church in Germany and Switzerland might try the effect of their counsels upon him. He himself addressed letters to them, in which he most earnestly entreated them to give Thamer a fair hearing, and to go into the matter thoroughly with him. It was labour in vain; since, where the disputants started from points so opposite, neither a middle point of agreement nor a mutual understanding could be arrived at by means of a few polemical conversations. A man of Thamer's mental perversity and passionateness could hardly be convinced by arguments, and he was, moreover, too widely separated from his antagonists by the question of the first principles involved, to make it possible for him to

[a] See Rommel's *Gesch. Philipps d. Grossen*, bd. iii. s. 293, u. d. f.

be

Digitized by Google

be influenced by the refutation of particular assertions. He stood, probably, at a greater distance from the entire theological stand-point of that age than he was himself aware. Where he did not clearly understand himself, or did not express himself clearly, this was occasioned by his attempting to connect things which were mutually incompatible.

Melanchthon, otherwise so gentle and liberal, who within a certain limit gladly tolerated a difference of sentiment with regard to religious matters, was, however, indulgent least of all towards such a spiritual tendency as this. Thamer appeared to him under the character of a restless man, fond of controversy and of paradox, and inclined to wild fanaticism.[b] Thamer's manner of proceeding must have been particularly offensive to his healthy, simple love of truth, and his purity of mind: his cautious, scientific spirit, his sober Christian spirit, rose in opposition against it. With profound historical sagacity he perceived what tremendous, destructive revolutions must be occasioned by such spiritualizing tendencies, if they should ever be able to prevail. Although so great a friend to the study of classical antiquity, in intimate acquaintance with the ancient writers, and in thorough mastery of the art of exposition far superior to Thamer, he could not approve the manner in which the latter expressed himself concerning the relation of the Greek philosophy to Christianity. Nay, it was precisely his more profound knowledge, as of Christianity and the Bible, so also of antiquity, which prevented him from assenting to such decisions. He charges Thamer with confounding the law and the Gospel, placing the law of nature on an equality with Christianity, and making out of the divinity of Christ, the Logos, nothing else than the knowledge of the law. He thinks that such a tendency must introduce a Turkish profanity.[c] He says of him that he transforms the doctrine of the Gospel concerning the Son of God into heathen allegories, just as if he had to expound Hesiod.[d]

---

[b] Τετυφωμένος is the predicate which he applies to him in two epistles of the year 1553. See *Corp. Reformator.* ed. Bretschneider, t. viii. pp. 56, 58.—In a letter to the preacher G. Buchholzer, at Berlin, of the year 1557 (which was first published in this collection), he says: 'Semper fuit rixosa et hallucinatoria ipsius natura.' T. ix. p. 153.—Referring to the Landgrave's embassage already mentioned, he says in a letter to Chytræus at Rostock, April 4, 1553: 'Missus est a Landgravio ad Sneppium [in Jena] et ad me. Gloriatur, se ire per Germaniam triumphantem. T. viii. p. 67.

[c] In the letter to Chytræus he says of him: 'Circumfert ethnica deliramenta, ac contendit divinitatem in Christo, τὸν λόγον, esse ipsam legis notitiam.'—L. c. p. 67.—In a letter to Collin at Prague, first published by Bretschneider: 'Abolet discrimen legis et evangelii et evangelium ait tantum esse νόμον φυσικόν. Hæc est παρασκευὴ πρὸς βεβηλότητα τουρκικήν.'—L. c. p. 70.

[d] Thus he writes in the year 1555: 'Evangelii doctrinam de filio Dei in ethnicas allegorias transformat, perinde ac si Hesiodum interpretaretur.'—T. viii. p. 551.

Since

Digitized by Google

Since these last experiments with Thamer also proved ineffectual, the Landgrave withdrew from all connection with him. From Zürich Thamer betook himself to Milan, and thence to Rome, where he spent above a year. He then succeeded in obtaining an appointment as Court Preacher to the Bishop of Minden, who was Duke of Brunswick. Here he fell anew into manifold controversies with the Protestant theologians. In the year 1557 there was circulated a cautionary letter directed against him, which proceeded from Wittenberg, and was probably composed by Melanchthon.[e] It contained a collection of the errors attributed to Thamer, the greater number of which are certainly to be found in his writings. In conformity with the principles which Melanchthon was accustomed to put forth on other occasions, the authorities were admonished to check by force the spread of such blasphemous doctrines. The mode of proceeding adopted against Servetus at Geneva was represented as an example worthy of imitation.[f] The principles of the medieval ecclesiastical law, which were opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, and against which Luther's doctrine of faith had at first risen in opposition, had gradually, since the controversies about the Lord's Supper and the peasants' war, obtained the ascendency again even among the Protestants; and it required a new reaction of the genuine Protestant spirit, as it proceeded from Spener, in order at last to overcome these principles again.

Thamer, being unable to find any rest in his new abode, went to Mayence, and there returned to the Catholic Church. In this place he received a canonicate.[g] He became at last Professor of Theology at Freiburg in the Breisgau, and died in the year 1569.

[e] 'De Thamero vagante in diœcesi Mindensi commonefactio.' Inserted in the *Corp. Ref.*, t. ix. p. 131.

[f] 'Quod quidem gubernatores pios non modo in populo Judaico, sed aliarum etiam reges gentium cognita vera de Deo doctrina legimus fecisse sedulo, ut adversus Deum contumelias sanctissimis edictis et gravissimis pœnis coërcere studerent.' Of the execution of Servetus, he says: 'Pium et memorabile ad omnem posteritatem exemplum.' At the time when Thamer was making a noise at Frankfort on the Maine, Melanchthon wrote to his antagonist, the preacher Hartmann Bayer: 'Miror magistratuum negligentiam in re tanta.'—T. viii. p. 159. And at a later period: 'Pii gubernatores adversus illam giganteam audaciam severitate utantur.'—L. c. p. 551.

[g] When the Jesuit Nicolas Serrarius (*De doctis Moguntiæ hominibus*, c. 12, in *Joannes rerum Moguntiacarum*, t. i. f. 129) speaks of Thamer's *mira ad fidem catholicam accessio*, it will be seen from the preceding narrative what is to be thought, in general, of this his conversion to Catholicism, and of that which is alleged to be miraculous in connection with it. The story which is told is the following:—When Thamer was accompanying the Landgrave at the siege of Ingoldstadt, in the War of Schmalkald, he found in a shop a fragment of the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, which was being used as waste paper. In this way he met with the section on Justification; and this was the first occasion of his conversion. He continued afterwards to read Catholic writings, and thus became more and more convinced of the truth of the Catholic doctrine.

ON

Digitized by Google

ON THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF SAINT MATTHEW'S GOSPEL,

WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO DR. DAVIDSON'S INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By Samuel Prideaux Tregelles.

In the following remarks I propose to consider what was the original language in which St. Matthew wrote his Gospel, by an examination of ancient evidence in connection with the circumstances which relate to that testimony. As the recent work of Dr. Davidson has given a prominence to certain arguments, and as counter-statements have been made, I believe a review of the whole question to be desirable.

The first thing to be considered is the direct evidence of ancient writers. Of these, the earliest relating to this subject is Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia. The date usually assigned to him is about the year 118. He was himself a hearer of some immediate disciples of our Lord; he knew John the Presbyter and Aristion, who (we are informed) had been disciples of Christ when on earth. He was a contemporary of the Apostle John during his latter years, although whether he had ever received instructions from him is uncertain.[a] His information respecting books of Scripture was derived from John the Presbyter. Papias was the author of a work intitled 'Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord,'[b] of which fragments have been preserved by Eusebius and others. In a passage given by Eusebius (*Hist. Ecc.* iii. 39), he says (repeating apparently the words of John the Presbyter), 'Matthew indeed wrote the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, but every one interpreted them as he was able.'[c]

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, lived through the greater part of the second century. The date of his birth is unknown: his death is commonly placed in the year 202. His early years were spent in Asia Minor, where he was instructed by Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who had been himself a disciple of the Apostle John.

[a] I do not enter into the question whether Papias had been a hearer of the Apostle John or not. Irenæus appears to have thought this was the case. Eusebius does not *prove* the contrary: he only shows that in the passage which he cites, Papias does not expressly assert it.

[b] λογιῶν κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις.

[c] Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο· ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος.

Digitized by Google

Irenæus gives a clear account of the original language of St. Matthew's Gospel. The following is his statement which has been transmitted to us (like the rest of his works against heresies) in the old Latin version, and, in the more important sentence, in a citation of Eusebius.

'For we do not know what has been arranged for our salvation through other persons, than through those through whom the Gospel has reached us: then, indeed, they proclaimed it; but afterwards, through the will of God, they delivered to us in writing [or in the Scriptures] what was to be the ground and pillar of our faith. For it is not allowable to say that they preached before they had a perfect knowledge, as some dare to say, boasting that they are the correctors of the Apostles. For after our Lord arose from the dead, and they were indued with the power of Holy Ghost coming on them from on high, they were altogether furnished, and had a perfect knowledge: they went forth unto the ends of the earth preaching the Gospel of those good things which we have from God, and declaring heavenly peace to men; inasmuch as they all and individually had the Gospel of God. Matthew accordingly, among the Hebrews, put forth also a Scripture [or writing] of the Gospel in their own dialect.'[d]

This latter clause is thus preserved in Greek by Eusebius (*Hist. Ecc.*, v. 8):—ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου.[e]

The Apostles preached first, the Gospels were written afterwards: they wrote the same things which they had preached; and thus it was that Matthew acted amongst those of his own nation; when, after having testified orally, he delivered to them the Gospel narrative in their own tongue.

PANTÆNUS was the head of the catechetical school of Alexandria, towards the latter part of the second century. We learn from Eusebius that he went to preach in the East as far as India.

'It is said that he showed such alacrity, with zealous disposition, with regard to the divine word, that he became a herald of the Gospel of Christ to the nations of the East, and that he reached as far as the land of the Indians. For there were then still many evangelists of the word, who were diligent to exercise a divine zeal, after the apostolic example, for the increase and building

[d] 'Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc præconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum. Nec enim fas est dicere, quoniam ante prædicaverunt, quam perfectam haberent agnitionem; sicut quidam audent dicere, gloriantes, emendatores se esse Apostolorum. Postea enim quam surrexit Dominus noster a mortuis et induti sunt supervenientis Spiritus Sancti virtutem ex alto, de omnibus adimpleti sunt, et habuerunt perfectam agnitionem, exierunt in fines terræ, ea quæ a Deo nobis bona sunt evangelizantes, et cœlestem pacem hominibus annuntiantes, qui quidem et omnes pariter et singuli eorum habentes Evangelium Dei. Ita Matthæus in Hebræis ipsorum linguâ scripturam edidit Evangelii.'—*Cont. Hær.* iii. 1.

[e] Had the whole sentence of Irenæus been considered in its connection, no difficulty would have arisen as to the meaning of the words preserved in Greek. The καὶ before γραφὴν becomes plain enough as to its force.

up

Digitized by Google

up of the word of God. Of whom Pantænus also was one: and it is said that he went to the Indians. The account is, that he found there the Gospel of Matthew, which was there prior to his arrival, amongst some who had received the knowledge of Christ, to whom Bartholomew, one of the Apostles, had preached; and that he had left behind the Scripture of Matthew in the Hebrew letters themselves; and that it was preserved up to the time in question.'[f]

Jerome gives a similar account of Pantænus; he adds, however, one circumstance:—

'He found that Bartholomew, one of the Twelve Apostles, had preached the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the Gospel of Matthew, which, when he returned to Alexandria, *he brought with him* written in Hebrew letters.'[g]

Eusebius, it must be remembered, is not merely in this narration transmitting a rumour of what Pantænus had done; he gives the account which was received and believed as true. About fifty-two years intervened between the death of Pantænus and the birth of Eusebius, so that the latter might well receive the accounts of what the former had done from competent witnesses. And, further, the school of which Pantænus had been the head, continued at Alexandria in the days of Eusebius, so that there was a distinct channel for the transmission of true accounts respecting him.

The testimony of ORIGEN, the most learned ecclesiastical writer of the third century, is thus given by Eusebius:—

'As I have learned by tradition concerning the four Gospels, which alone are received without question in the Church of God under heaven; that the first written was that according to Matthew, formerly a publican, but afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ; and that he gave it forth to those who had believed from Judaism, composed in Hebrew letters.'[h]

The

---

[f] τοσαύτην δ' οὖν φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐκθυμοτάτῃ διαθέσει προθυμίαν περὶ τὸν θεῖον λόγον ἐνδείξασθαι, ὡς καὶ κήρυκα τοῦ κατὰ Χριστὸν εὐαγγελίου τοῖς ἐπ' ἀνατολῆς ἔθνεσιν ἀναδειχθῆναι, μέχρι καὶ τῆς Ἰνδῶν στειλάμενον γῆς. ἦσαν γὰρ εἰσέτι τότε πλείους εὐαγγελισταὶ τοῦ λόγου, ἔνθεον ζῆλον ἀποστολικοῦ μιμήματος συνεισφέρειν ἐπ' αὐξήσει καὶ οἰκοδομῇ τοῦ θείου λόγου προθυμούμενοι. ὧν εἷς γενόμενος καὶ ὁ Πάνταινος, καὶ εἰς Ἰνδοὺς ἐλθεῖν λέγεται· ἔνθα λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτὸν προφθάσαν τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν, τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον παρά τισιν αὐτόθι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπεγνωκόσιν· οἷς Βαρθολομαῖον τῶν ἀποστόλων ἕνα κηρύξαι. αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι, τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφήν· ἣν καὶ σώζεσθαι εἰς τὸν δηλούμενον χρόνον.—*Hist. Ecc.* v. 10.

[g] 'Reperit Bartholomæum de duodecim apostolis adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi juxta Matthæi evangelium prædicasse, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum revertens Alexandriam secum retulit.'—*Script. Ecc.* 36.

It has been conjectured by some, and stated as indubitable by others, that *India* in which Pantænus preached means Southern Arabia. Jerome, however, did not so understand. He says—'Pantænus, stoicæ sectæ Philosophus, ob præcipuæ eruditionis gloriam, a Demetrio Alexandriæ Episcopo, missus est in Indiam, ut Christus *apud Brachmanas*, et illius gentis philosophos, prædicaret.'—*Epistola ad Magnum*, I. lxx. Ed. Vallarsi.

[h] 'ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων Εὐαγγελίων ἃ καὶ μόνα ἀναντιῤῥήτά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ· ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν ποτὲ

Digitized by Google

The 'tradition' of which Origen or Eusebius speaks is not to be confounded with mere vague report; παράδοσις is *tradition* in its proper sense, *i. e.*, 'account delivered;' this is the account which Origen had received as that which Christians believed on the subject.

Origen, in another place, says just the same thing (*Comment. in Joan.* iv. 132).

EUSEBIUS himself, in giving as exact an account as he could of the Apostolic writings, speaks thus of St. Matthew's Gospel:—

'Matthew having previously preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go also to others, delivered to them the Gospel according to him in their paternal language, and filled up to those from whom he went by his writing the want of his own presence.'[j]

EPIPHANIUS, who was acquainted with Hebrew, says:—

'This Matthew then, writes the Gospel in Hebrew letters, and preaches, and begins not from the beginning, but he narrates the genealogy from Abraham.'[k]

Had this, in the fourth century, been a *peculiar* opinion, Epiphanius would not have spoken of it in this manner.

Many other writers, in the same century, speak to the same effect, such as Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory Nazianzen, and Augustine. Their very names show how generally this was believed.

JEROME, however, in the same century, supplies us with further information, and this is all the more valuable on account of his research and learning. He says:—

'Matthew, also called Levi, first a publican, afterwards an Apostle, was the first who wrote a Gospel in Judea, in the Hebrew letters and language, for the benefit of those of the circumcision who had believed: it is not known who afterwards translated it into Greek. Moreover, the Hebrew itself is in the Library at Cæsarea, which Pamphilus the Martyr collected with great care. I, too, was permitted by the Nazarenes of Berœa, a city of Syria, who use this volume, to take a copy.'[m]

ποτὲ τελώνην. ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεύσασι, γράμμασι Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντετεταγμένον.' κ. τ. λ.—*Hist. Ecc.* vi. 25.

[j] 'Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἑβραίοις κηρύξας, ὡς ἔμελλε καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρους ἰέναι, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ γραφῇ παραδοὺς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον, τὸ λεῖπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, τούτοις ἀφ' ὧν ἐστέλλετο, διὰ τῆς γραφῆς ἀνεπλήρου.'—*Hist. Ecc.* iii. 24.

[k] 'Καὶ οὗτος μὲν οὖν ὁ Ματθαῖος Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασι γράφει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ κηρύττει, καὶ ἄρχεται οὐκ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἀλλὰ διηγεῖται μὲν τὴν γενεαλογίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ.'—lib. ii. 1.

[m] Matthæus, qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Judæa propter eos, qui ex circumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit, quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliothecâ, quam Pamphilus Martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque à Nazarenis qui in Beroea, urbe Syriæ, hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit.'—*De Viris Illus.* c. iii.

In

Digitized by Google

In other places Jerome *repeatedly* mentions the Hebrew original of St. Matthew's Gospel. By Hebrew, and similar terms, the language is of course intended which the Jews used in our Lord's days; an Aramæan dialect, which some might call Chaldee or Syriac.

The document which Jerome procured at Berœa, he had translated *before* he wrote his book *De Viris Illustribus;* for he says in the *second* chapter (the one *before* that from which the above citation is taken) :[n]—

'The Gospel also, which is called according to the Hebrews, and which was lately translated into Greek and Latin by me, which also Origen often uses.'[o]

He mentions the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in other places, in such a way as to show that he identified it fully with the Hebrew Matthew at Cæsarea, and with what he had procured at Berœa. Thus—

'In this Gospel which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which we lately translated from Hebrew into Greek, and which is called by most the authentic Matthew.'[p]

'In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was written, indeed, in the Chaldee and Syrian language, but in Hebrew letters, which the Nazarenes read to this day, the Gospel according to the Apostles, or, as most consider, according to Matthew, which is also in the library at Cæsarea.'[q]

In one of the passages given above, it is said by Jerome that Origen often used the Gospel according to the Hebrews; we find two citations from it in his extant writings.

The witnesses which have been brought forward state that St. Matthew did write in Hebrew, and for Jews in Judea, prior to his leaving that country to preach elsewhere: that at the end of the second century the Hebrew Gospel was extant, and was seen by Pantænus. Jerome adds that it was still existing in his day at Cæsarea, and that it was substantially identical with the Gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites.

---

[n] I wish to call attention to the entire freedom from all ambiguity which there is in Jerome's statement as to the translation of this document. In chap. ii. he says that *he* himself translated the Nazarene gospel into Greek and Latin; in chap. iii. he says that it was unknown who had translated St. Matthew's gospel into Greek, *i. e.* who had made the translation which Christians had used for centuries. It will be seen below *why* I direct attention to so simple a point.

[o] 'Evangelium quoque, quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes sæpe utitur.'

[p] 'In evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum.'—*Comment. Matt.* xii. 13.

[q] 'In evangelio juxta Hebræos quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone, sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est, quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum apostolos, sive, ut plerique autumant juxta Matthæum, quod et in Cæsariensi bibliothecâ,' &c.—*Cont. Pelag.* iii. 1.

Epiphanius

Digitized by Google

Epiphanius has been already adduced as a witness to the opinion of the fourth century on the Hebrew original of St. Matthew. He, too, identifies the Gospel used by the Nazarenes with that of Matthew in Hebrew. He says:—

'They [the Nazarenes] have the Gospel according to Matthew very full in Hebrew; for, amongst them, this Gospel is undoubtedly still preserved, as it was originally written, in Hebrew letters. But I do not know whether they have taken away the genealogies from Abraham to Christ.'[r]

(Which the Ebionites had done.) He speaks of the name 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' as that which the Ebionites gave to the Hebrew copy of St. Matthew:—

'And they also receive the Gospel according to Matthew, for they also . . . use only this. They call it *according to the Hebrews*, as may be truly said, because Matthew alone, in the New Testament, made the publication and proclamation of the Gospel in Hebrew and in Hebrew letters.'[s]

By comparing Epiphanius with Jerome, we discover that the different copies of the Gospel according to the Hebrews varied in several respects; so that although both these writers identified this book with St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel, they considered it to be altered, and apparently interpolated. Indeed the citations from it, as given by Jerome and others (which Dr. Davidson has presented in a collected form), differ greatly from anything which we find in our canonical Matthew. It is easy to account for the citations having this character: there was no motive to quote from *this* document anything that was commonly read in St. Matthew; the mere fact of a reference being made to it shows that something peculiar was observed.[t]

It is clear from the citations made by Origen, that this Hebrew Gospel was considerably interpolated a century and a half before it fell into the hands of Jerome. It must also have received interpolations as early as the time of Clement of Alexandria, who once cites it. The additions seem to have been just the same in *kind* as those which we find in the Codex Bezæ, and they could be hardly greater in *degree* than what we find in that MS. in the Acts

---

[r] *Ἔχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἑβραϊστί. παρ' αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφῶς τοῦτο, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν, ἔτι σώζεται. οὐκ οἶδα δὲ, εἰ καὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας τὰς ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἄχρι Χριστοῦ περιεῖλον.—Hæs.* xxix. § 9.

[s] *Καὶ δέχονται μὲν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον, τούτῳ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ . . . χρῶνται μονῷ· καλοῦσι δὲ αὐτὸ κατὰ Ἑβραίους, ὡς ἀληθῆ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι Ματθαῖος μόνος Ἑβραϊστὶ καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν ἐν τῇ καινῇ διαθήκῃ ἐποιήσατο τὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔκθεσίν τε καὶ κήρυγμα.—Hæs.* xxx. § 3.

[t] In Martianay's edition of the old Latin version of St. Matthew (Paris, 1695), he gives the various readings of a Latin Codex Sangermanensis. In Matt. iii., this MS. reads 'Et cum baptizeretur Jesus lumen magnum fulgebat de aqua; ita ut timerent omnes qui congregati erant.' This looks like an addition of the Nazarene document; it may have sprung from Jerome's (now lost) translation of it.

of

Digitized by Google

of the Apostles.[u] Had it not differed considerably from the canonical Matthew, Jerome could have had no motive for translating it. Perhaps he only translated those passages which contained additions or variations. And yet he unhesitatingly identified it with St. Matthew's Gospel! This shows how manifest it must have been that it was originally the same; just as the Book of Acts in the Codex Bezæ might be identified with the book written by St. Luke; and yet who would be surprised if one spoke hesitatingly about this copy of the Book of Acts being authentic? And is not this just the manner in which Jerome expresses himself at different times? The less decided expressions, 'commonly called,' 'commonly considered,' exactly appear to suit the case.[x]

Thus, then, we have ancient testimony that the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew was still used in the fourth century, but with various interpolations, by the bodies of Jewish Christians; and that this interpolated Matthew was the book called the Gospel according to the Hebrews, a book which had been known to Hegesippus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, and which had been mentioned by Eusebius.

The question whether St. Matthew actually wrote in Hebrew *might* be considered, irrespective of the Gospel used by the Nazarenes; but as Jerome identifies that Hebrew document with the original of St. Matthew, it is needful thus to mention what we know respecting it.

If, then, we abide by ancient testimony, we find that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and that we know not who made the Greek translation which we possess. The ancients who state these things were themselves accustomed to Greek, and they could have no motive, such as prepossession, to lead them to assert that St. Matthew wrote in another tongue. If they had consulted the honour of their own language instead of *truth*, they would not have stated the Hebrew original. In this conclusion Christians acquiesced for ages: they used with all confidence the Greek copy which the early Christians had transmitted to them: they used it (as they, too, had done) as authoritative Scripture, and they knew of no dangerous consequence which could result from their freely owning that they held it to be a translation of what the Apostle had written. There is no *evidence* of ancient witnesses that the Apostle wrote in any other language than that

[u] And yet the document itself might possess great value; just as the readings of the Codex Bezæ have great weight in spite of its interpolations.

[x] Marcion's Evangelium was certainly an altered copy of St. Luke's Gospel; this might be spoken of as a spurious work if the alterations were specially considered, or as the work of St. Luke if the basis were specially regarded. The Nazarene document might be mentioned just in the same way. Jerome, however, never calls it spurious.

Aramæan

Digitized by Google

Aramæan dialect which the Jews then spoke, and which was commonly then called Hebrew, though differing from the ancient language of that name.

I think that it is manifest that the onus probandi rests on those who hold that St. Matthew wrote in some other language than Hebrew: the maintainers of this ancient opinion may well ask why they should be called on to renounce it? What evidence is there for an original in another language? And if St. Matthew did not write in Hebrew, *what claim has any one other language more than another to be considered the original?*

But it is *asserted* that St. Matthew wrote in Greek: this assertion is believed by many; and I have now to examine the grounds on which the opinion is considered to be true.

To maintain the Greek original there ought to be,—1st, a refutation of the evidence advanced in favour of the Hebrew: 2nd, at least equal evidence in favour of the Greek; and, 3rd, a proof that such evidence is equally congruent with the facts of the case.

The lines of (supposed) demonstration taken by the advocates of the Greek original, are commonly these:—1st. They seek to show that the Greek Gospel which we possess is not a translation: 2nd. They endeavour to weaken or nullify the evidence of the ancients in favour of the Hebrew. 3rd. They maintain that the Greek original is more in accordance with the principles of the dealings of God, and thus they endeavour to give a *dogmatic* sanction to their opinion.

The Greek original has, on these grounds, obtained the support of many respectable names, and has been defended by not a few critics. The opinion seems to be no older than three centuries and a half; it appears to have originated in a kind of *feeling* that our Greek Gospel is not like a translation; this feeling was afterwards strengthened by dogmatic considerations in connection with the perfectness of Scripture; and then the direct evidence to the contrary was but little regarded.

Later critics, such as Hug and Moses Stuart, who have held this opinion, have sought to weaken or invalidate the ancient testimony. This, then, demands the first consideration, for who can concede that *opinions* are to be set above *attested facts?*

The evidence of Papias is treated as though it had but little weight, because of what Eusebius says of *the smallness of his understanding*. And yet Eusebius considered him to be a competent witness, for he uses his testimony with approbation.[y] A witness

[y] I do not stay to discuss the objections which some have raised against understanding the λόγια, which Papias says that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, as meaning

Digitized by Google

witness may have but little mental power, and yet be very competent to state facts. This was the case with *John Strype*, the author of *Memorials of Cranmer*, &c. &c. One ground on which the *understanding* of Papias has been assailed, has been his belief in the doctrine of a Millennium: but if *this* be a ground for treating his testimony as unworthy of credence, what shall we say of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Hippolytus, and many others in ancient times, and also not a few in the present day? 'A question' (says Principal Campbell) 'on which if Papias erred, he erred along with many not deficient in understanding.' Indeed there are many who would rather regard Eusebius to have been in error in denying the pre-millennial advent of our Lord, than Papias in asserting it, even though they may object to the *earthly* description of the sentiments of Papias as given by Eusebius.[s]

After the opponents of the Hebrew original have thus attempted to invalidate the testimony of Papias, they endeavour to merge all the other evidence into his. None has attempted this with more plausibility than Hug.[t] He tries to show that Irenæus simply learned this from Papias, Origen from Irenæus, and so on. But specific proof that this was the case is not presented; nor, indeed, can it be. But is it not too much to *assume* that Irenæus and others only copied from Papias; then to *assume* that Papias was of too weak an intellect to be received as a witness; and then to deduce from this twofold *assumption* that what has been stated as a fact was not so? But these two assumptions involve a third, that all the early Christians were led, on the authority of Papias, to believe that the Greek Gospel, which they possessed, was only a translation; that no one had a word to say in opposition to this

---

meaning the canonical Gospel. All the ancients understood Papias as I do. If the 'Oracles' indicate some other work, then it would follow that there once existed a divine book by Matthew of which there is no trace save in the passage of Papias.

Nor do I discuss whether the statement is that of Papias himself, or whether (as in what precedes) he repeats the words of John the Presbyter: this latter view carries the testimony far higher; I believe it to be correct, but I do not insist on it; for if the words be those of Papias himself it is sufficient for the present question.

[s] It has been thought that Eusebius speaks in different places in a different manner with regard to Papias. In one passage (iii. 36) there occur the words—*ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογιώτατος καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων*, 'a man very eloquent in every respect, and versed in the scripture.' Valesius argues with some force, that, as these words are not found in some MSS., and as they appear to be wanting in the translation of Ruffinus, they must be spurious. It is useless, however, to say that they are *inconsistent* with what Eusebius elsewhere says; for a man may be well acquainted with scripture, and be extremely eloquent, whose understanding is extremely weak. How many proofs do we see of this!

[t] The manner in which this learned man treats the question is such that I do not wonder that he has led many with him in it. For good remarks on his train of argument, I must refer to Dr. Davidson's volume. I here take up the points themselves concisely in connection with what others have advanced.

opinion,

Digitized by Google

opinion, which yet (it is endeavoured to be shown) was wholly incorrect. All these assumptions are necessary if the evidence of Papias and others be summarily set aside.

That Irenæus should be listened to so little in such a case is remarkable, when his connection with the Apostolic age is fully considered.

But Pantænus would still remain as an independent witness; and the account that he found in India the Gospel of St. Matthew in Aramæan, cannot be resolved into the statement of Papias.

Origen says that he learned, 'by tradition,' that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew: by tradition he does not mean mere vague report, but 'received account:' this was what the Christians knew about the matter; it was as much a point of common information amongst them that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, as that he wrote a Gospel at all. Origen is a good witness to this current belief.

Nor would Origen, and Eusebius after him, have stated this to be the fact, had they thought it capable of doubt or question: they, at least, would not have blindly followed the Millennarian Papias. But they had no other opinion to mention.[b]

Principal Campbell thus states the mode adopted, in opposing the evidence for the Hebrew original, and shows its weakness:—

'"But" (says some modern disputants) "all the witnesses you can produce in support of this fact may, for aught we know, be reducible to one. Irenæus, perhaps, has had his information only from Papias, and Origen from Papias and Irenæus, and so of all the rest downwards, how numerous soever; so that the whole evidence may be, at bottom, no more than the testimony of Papias." But is the positive testimony of witnesses, delivered as of a well-known fact, to be overturned by a mere supposition, *a perhaps*? for that the case was really as they suppose, no shadow of evidence is pretended.'—(ii. 171.)

That St. Matthew wrote in Judea, and for believing Jews, is admitted; but even this has been used as a ground for supporting the idea of a Greek original. Hug has endeavoured to show that Greek rather than Aramæan was the prevailing language of Palestine in our Lord's days. No doubt very many knew Greek; but the New Testament itself supplies us with sufficient testimony to the prevalence of Hebrew.[c] A consideration of this kind

[b] As to the argument used by Hug, and repeated by Moses Stuart, that Eusebius gives one opinion in recording as an historian, and another as a critic, I think it sufficient to refer to Dr. Davidson, p. 12.

[c] The condition of the Holy Land then may be illustrated by the present state of Wales as to language. In towns, and amongst persons of education, English is well known; but the mass of the *people* use their own Welsh: anything intended for circulation amongst them must be in their own language. Even those who use English as a language of business, and for intercourse with the English, *prefer* their own tongue. Indeed it would not be easy to command attention in any continuous address except in Welsh; for it requires something more than a mere ability to speak

Digitized by Google

kind *confirms* the previous evidence, while no proof of the diffusion of Greek would suffice to overturn it.

One mode of attacking the testimony to a Hebrew original has been by the supposition that the early witnesses confounded the original of St. Matthew with 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews;' and that this gospel was, in fact, merely one of the apocryphal documents current amongst heretical sects. I have already shown that the Nazarenes and Ebionites did use a Hebrew Gospel known by some under this name; and that competent witnesses, who knew Hebrew, identify this with the original of St. Matthew. They do not treat it as some mere apocryphal document, but as a genuine work, though interpolated in various ways. The fact that the Hebrew Christians used a Hebrew Gospel thoroughly invalidates the assumption (mentioned above) that St. Matthew would probably have written in Greek for the Jews. But the idea that the early Christians confounded some spurious production with the original writing of an Apostle, implies that those who advance the opinion rank their intelligence with regard to their sacred books very low.

The Gospel according to the Hebrews is identified by ancient witnesses as what St. Matthew wrote, just as Marcion's *Evangelium* might be *identified* with St. Luke's Gospel. *The Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles* is spoken of as spurious: the only ground for identifying these two last mentioned works is one passage in Jerome (given above), where he says, 'The Gospel according to the Hebrews . . . . which the Nazarenes still use, *according to the Apostles*, or, as most suppose, according to Matthew.' This is wholly insufficient to identify two documents which are *described* in very different language.[d] 'The Gospel according to the *twelve*

---

speak a language occasionally, and to read it, to enable one to attend to it continuously. Any one may make proof of this by listening to a sermon in a language which he has learned: it is only by *practice in listening* that he can *attend* to it properly.

Just so Greek was no language for the Jews in Judea, and still less so for those in eastern countries. I doubt whether Greek *ever* prevailed in Palestine. (See Dr. Davidson in answer to Hug and Dominico Diodati, p. 37–44.)

Extensive conclusions may be drawn from slight proofs. What if, in future ages, some critic wished to show that Latin is now commonly understood in Wales? He might show, first, that, in the twelfth century, Archbishop Baldwin preached throughout Wales *in Latin;* second, that after the use of divine service in a tongue not understood by the people had been rejected, a special act of Parliament in Queen Elizabeth's reign authorizes the use of the church service *in Latin* in those places of Wales where English is not known; third, that Bishop Bethell, on his translation in 1830 from Exeter to Bangor, revived the use of this service *in Latin.* To many this would seem a good line of proof. It was indeed asked, in the case of Bishop Bethell, whether he wanted to be *translated again.* Such lines of proof can never overturn direct evidence to the contrary.

[d] It is remarkable that an attempt has been made to represent the Gospel according to the Hebrews as a translation from the Greek; Dr. Davidson (p. 17) has thoroughly met the *supposed* proofs of this.

Digitized by Google

Apostles' was heretical; that 'according to the Apostles' was said in this passage to be the same as 'according to the Hebrews.'*

But no allegation that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was some spurious document, which had been confounded with the genuine production of Matthew by those who might be ignorant of Hebrew, could account for the statements made by those who knew Hebrew well. And no supposition relative to this document would suffice to explain away the account of Pantænus. Had it not been thought that considerations drawn from the Gospel according to the Hebrews would help to invalidate the testimony to St. Matthew's original language, the subject might have been discussed without reference to that document: but because of the statements which have been made in connection with this Gospel, I have given above the accounts which we have respecting it, and they are thus found to be in full accordance with what we know from other sources; and they supply good proof that (though interpolated) the Aramæan St. Matthew was still extant and well known in the fourth century.

It is, however, very important to remember that *if* it were proved that the Gospel according to the Hebrews were some spurious production, and that Jerome was mistaken in identifying it with the original of St. Matthew, still the direct chain of evidence that he did write in Hebrew would be untouched. That *fact* would be equally established. Supposing that all which has been advanced in opposition to early testimony on this point had the *full weight* which the deniers of a Hebrew original desire, it would amount, after all, to nothing more than that a *doubt* has

---

* Even if it be thought that the Gospel 'according to the Apostles' and that 'of the twelve Apostles' were the same Apocryphal document, it need cause no difficulty. For in the *very passage* in which Jerome thus identifies them, he displays a lapse of memory of a similar kind as he would in identifying an Apocryphal document with the Hebrew Matthew, for he ascribes to *S. Ignatius* a passage which really occurs in the Epistle that bears the name of *Barnabas*.

Jerome's failure of memory is no impeachment of his general accuracy, and it can cause no surprise; for at the time when he wrote the book in question (*Dialogue against the Pelagians*) he was *eighty-five* years old. A similar lapse of memory was that of Beza, when, in his last edition of the New Testament (1598), he *twice* (Luke xix. 26, and Acts xx. 3) cites the Codex *Claromontanus*, which was still in his possession, by mistake for the Codex *Bezæ*, which he had sent to Cambridge. He was then in his *eightieth* year. Not every octogenarian has the ability of Jerome or of Beza: few can say with Simonides,—

'μνημὴν οὔ τινα φημὶ Σιμωνίδῃ ἰσοφαρίζειν
'ογδωκονταέτει παιδὶ Λεωπρεπέος.'

It is rather curious that Julianus of Eclanum accused Jerome of upholding a *fifth* gospel. And, surely, if we say that to maintain the Hebrew original of St. Matthew is to expunge one of the canonical gospels, we shall uphold a point just as tenable as that of Julianus.

been

Digitized by Google

been suggested, a *possibility* shown that witnesses *may* have erred, it could demonstrate nothing, and would still leave the whole question undetermined. How unsatisfactory! to reject *evidence*, and to have nothing in its stead but *suppositions*.

All this endeavour to avoid the evidence *originated* in one of two things—the opinion that the present Greek Gospel bears all the marks of an original writing, and that, therefore, all testimony to its being a translation must be rejected; or, in the supposition that no inspired book could be lost. These opinions, then, require examination.

It is granted that St. Matthew's Gospel in Greek does not seem like a translation; that the language does not seem less original than the other New Testament writings; and that, unless we had external testimony, we should, probably, not have imagined it to be a version: but all this does not *prove* the contrary. Are there no works which we *know* are translations, which bear no internal impress of the fact? And are we not well aware how fallacious often are remarks drawn from mere style and manner?[1] The *Lord's Prayer* in English certainly reads as little like a translation as prayers which had their origin in our own language: but what should we say if any one questioned its being a translation? Perhaps, however, it is too much to say that, knowing *independently* that St. Matthew wrote in Aramæan, we do not find *some traces* of this in our Greek Gospel.

It has been argued that the ancient versions show that this Gospel must have been written in Greek, because they are taken from the Greek which we have, and not from an Aramæan source. This puts no difficulty in our way. The *Gospel-collection* was formed very early, and we have no trace of any ancient versions of separate Gospels: the Gospel-collection was publicly read in

[1] Moses Stuart (Notes to Fosdick's Hug, p. 710) thus concludes his argument:—'In a word, how can I read the Gospel of Matthew as it now lies before me, and feel that I am reading a translation made in ancient times? Where is any version like it? The Septuagint. That is greatly diverse from it, in very many and important respects. I can no more find internal evidences of a *version* in Matthew than I can in Mark, Luke, or John. I must believe, then, that the real *original* is before us. There is no evidence of an *Aramæan* original except what proves the Aramæan work at the same time to be spurious. Why should we then admit such an original?'

I pass by for the present the *very odd assertion*, that the same evidence which proves an Aramæan original proves the Aramæan work to be at the same time spurious. I wish to point out what a lofty pre-eminence is here given to *subjective feeling* on points of critical judgment. Stuart, however, elsewhere puts subjective feeling into its right place, and shows how mistaken it may be, and that too on much more important subjects than mere translation. He says—'If it were worth our while, it would be easy to show that men, even the best scholars, are liable to mistake in judgments of this nature [on ancient books], which depend on the style and tone of writings. Two or three notable instances that are recent may serve to illustrate and defend this position.' (*On the Canon*, Dr. Davidson's edition, p. 52.)

Digitized by Google

the Christian assemblies, and it was from *this collection* that the early versions were formed. Whatever be the age of the Syriac, it has no real bearing on the question, because, like the other versions, it was a translation of the Greek collection.[6]

But it has been argued that our Greek Gospel *must* be an original document. If this *must* be the case, let it once be *demonstrated*, and then evidence may be overlooked. This dogmatic view of the question has arisen from considerations relative to God and His mode of acting towards His creatures. It is alleged that no book which He did not intend for abiding use would be given by inspiration—that no mere translation can be authoritative, and that the old view stamps imperfection on the canon. It is affirmed that it is inconceivable that God should not have insured the preservation of an inspired book, and that the contrary would be, in some measure, contrary to the Divine perfections.

This tone of thought has greatly influenced many in their judgment of the question; they were rightly jealous for the perfectness of Scripture, and any theory which seemed to them to interfere with *their views* on the subject was forthwith discarded. I wish fully to uphold Scripture authority and perfection; but this may be done even while analysing these arguments.

When we speak of God and His dealings it is our place to take care not to substitute *our* thoughts respecting Him in the place of what He has revealed concerning himself. It is an easy thing to argue *à priori*, and to determine dogmatically what it is fitting for God to have done: but is this true reverence? are we authorised to do this? Could we argue in this way as to any of God's revelations? Some might think that the introductory dispensation of *law* was not such as became the divine perfections before the incarnation of Christ; some might demand one thing, some another. We know how some, from their own subjective feelings, reject those very truths which are the foundation of all Christian religion; the distinct personality of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the unity of the Godhead is made by them a stumbling-block, because it does not suit their *à priori* ideas of God; the incarnation of the eternal Son of God and redemption by His blood are in the same way rejected. And so, too, others find something unsuitable to their minds in the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, justification through faith. The Scripture supplies us with an instance of *à priori* argument as to what was fitting and suited to our Lord. He had told his disciples of the rejection, sufferings, and death which were before

[6] See the Syriac version, specially considered in Dr. Davidson, p. 49, in reply to Stuart's argument that the Syriac would certainly have been taken from the Hebrew St. Matthew, if it had existed.

Digitized by Google him;

him; but the apostle Peter (who had just before confessed him to be the Christ, the son of the living God), acting on his own personal feelings, said, 'This be far from thee, Lord; this shall not be unto thee:' the reproof of Christ is the fullest answer to those who would exalt God and His dealings in their own way, irrespective of what He has declared and what He has done. If we take the *à priori* line of arguing we may well ask (as Campbell observes), Can it be supposed that the *autographs* of the inspired writers should be *lost?* Can it be thought that the original and authoritative document should cease to be preserved? Is it according to the divine dealings that an infallible standard should not be transmitted for the use of all after ages?

Textual criticism was once met by the *à priori* line of argument. It was said that various readings in the text of the New Testament would be contrary to the care of God in preserving it. Is it not irreverent to think that God's Holy Word can have been subject to ordinary casualties? But this high ground of arguing was effectually met by the fact that the various readings *do* exist. No line of proof that a thing *cannot* exist is valid against the simple fact that it *does* exist. Let those who argue as if they knew fully what God *ought* to do in any particular case, give a proof of their intimate acquaintance with His mind; let them say in what manner it is fitting for Him to rule and order in any given circumstances.

If we brought *à priori* thoughts to God's revelation, how many things we might have expected to find different from what they are. Should we have *expected* difficulties? should we have thought *one* comprehensive life of our Lord, or many with different aspects, the more probable? Should we have thought it likely or not that any doubt could have arisen as to its statements? How many questions of this kind might we not ask? But we have God's revelation as *He* has seen fit to give it forth: it is our place humbly to acknowledge Him in His revelation and in His actings, and to own, as to all difficulties, that 'God is greater than man.'

But why should it not have been fitting for God to cause the earliest written inspired narrative of the teaching and actings of Christ to have been in the language of that people to which the mass of the first converts belonged? And why should any be surprised that God should have afterwards permitted this inspired record to fall into oblivion, as Christianity ceased amongst the Jews, and should only have preserved it in an ancient and authoritative version? The only answer to this, I believe, would be, that nothing inspired can be lost. But how do we *know* this? The Scripture never says so; and while I fully admit that God would

Digitized by Google

would not permit any book to be lost which he intended should belong to the canon, I ask, What authority have we to *limit* the operations of God, so as to deny that He might, if He saw fit, have given forth an inspired writing, even for a local or temporary object? A book was actually written by inspiration on one occasion, which was almost immediately *lost* beyond recovery. I mean that book of Jeremiah's prophecies which the king ordered to be burned. It is true that he dictated the prophecies again to Baruch, but 'many like words' were added; so that this was not a reproducing of the identical book which had been destroyed. Can proof be more plain than this, that God acts according to *His own* wisdom in the inspiration and preservation of Scripture?

As, then, I know nothing of God's actings except what he has revealed, I deny that this dogmatic point of view is valid in itself, or is a ground for rejecting the evidence to the Hebrew original of St. Matthew's Gospel.

It has been asked, what opinion can we form of the care of the early Christians over their sacred books, seeing they did not transmit a Hebrew original? If they believed in a Hebrew original, is it credible that they should have lost it? Whether *credible* or not, here are the facts: they *did* believe that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and yet they did not transmit the Hebrew document. Greek was the language they *used*, and they preserved to us the copy which they *used*, though they avowed it to be a version. They acted just in the same way with regard to the Old Testament; they avowed that it was written in Hebrew, and yet they used and transmitted the Greek LXX version, a version which (though Justin and some others believed the fiction of the Alexandrian Jews as to its inspiration) the learned amongst them knew was neither authoritative nor very correct.[h] This is a much

[h] I have had occasion, again and again, in this paper, to point out the futility of endeavouring to controvert *facts* by possibilities or probabilities. Let us take as an illustration Matthew Henry's Commentary. In future ages some one might seek learnedly to demonstrate that it *must* have been written in *Welsh*. Matthew Henry was a Welshman; he could not have been indifferent to the spiritual good of his own countrymen; his Commentary was written for the instruction of others: would it not be a reflection on his Christian consistency to suppose that he did *more* for the English than for the Welsh? And, besides, is it not more natural for a man to write in *his own* language? Again, the Commentary is extant both in Welsh and English; and why should we say that the latter is the original? Does it bear any traces of Welsh peculiarity or solecism? And if not, does it not show that it must have proceeded from the pen of a translator, who knew English far more correctly than a Welshman can be supposed to do? Is there not then every probability that the witnesses were *mistaken* who say that the English was the original? Besides, did they know even of the existence of the Welsh copy? or had they any acquaintance with that language? If not, of course their testimony is worth very little, and we may safely discard their opinion.

To prevent any one (*especially an anonymous writer, to whom I must presently turn*)

Digitized by Google

a much more remarkable case, because they transmitted the Greek Matthew as *authoritative*. But *how could* those who knew no Hebrew transmit *Hebrew* books?

But it is objected, the Greek version of St. Matthew (if a version) is transmitted to us as made by some person *unknown*. No doubt it is; but does this cast uncertainty upon it? The early writers who say the translator is unknown are surely worthy of all credit: had they not been transmitters of a faithful account, should we not have expected that this deficiency would have been supplied? And why should the fact of a book being *translated* by an *unknown* hand detract from its authority? Were not many canonical books *written* by unknown persons? Who shall say positively who *wrote* many of the Old Testament books? Who wrote Joshua, Judges, 2 Sam., Kings, Esther, and other books? And yet God has preserved to us these inspired anonymous volumes.

I do not think that any of the considerations taken either from the dealings of God, the nature of Scripture, or the internal character of our Greek Gospel, cast any suspicion on the direct evidence to the Hebrew original: I might say that, on the contrary, there is a peculiar suitability in this Gospel having been first presented to the Jews in their own language.

Having thus considered the arguments used in opposition to early testimony to the Hebrew original, I wish to repeat one question. Suppose it could be shown that we have no sufficient proof that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, would it follow that he must have written in *Greek?* This has been *assumed* by the advocates for a Greek original; but in fact if we get rid of *early testimony*, we are quite left in the dark as to the language. Why should not a claim be put in for other tongues besides Greek? why not Latin, or Coptic? What ground have we for intelligently rejecting the hypothesis of Hardouin, or the *Palæo-Romaic* suggestions of a modern imitator?

But on what ground do we believe that St. Matthew wrote a gospel at all? Because we learn it from ancient and competent witnesses. But the same witnesses affirm that he wrote in Hebrew; and if endeavours be made to cast doubt on *this part*

---

turn) from arguing in this way, be it known to all arguers from probabilities, that seventeen years ago I saw the Rev. Evan Griffiths of Swansea busily engaged in making the Welsh translation. I hope that my testimony to this fact will not be maltreated like the evidence of Papias.

Arguments *à priori* may be very valuable for showing a probability where there is no *evidence*, or where it is doubtful; but the least portion of proved *fact* will destroy all the mere probability.

of

Digitized by Google

of their testimony, the whole (to say the least) is weakened. I believe that many truly respectable advocates for the Greek original are but little aware that the same mode of argument would invalidate the fact that Matthew and others wrote Scripture at all. But happily this mode of treating ancient authorities is not received as legitimate; if it were, we might take our leave of all certainty as to almost every ancient fact whatever.[1]

It is not by weight of names that questions of fact and investigation can be decided. It does, however, free an opinion from all charge of novelty and innovation when it can be shown that it has been held by many. This opinion, then, of the Hebrew original of St. Matthew was *universal* from the end of the first century for fourteen hundred years; and since then, the ancient opinion has been retained by not a few. The following names amongst others have been mentioned as holding it:—Conr. Horneius, George Calixtus, Ægid. Hunnius, J. Conr. Dannhauer, J. Meisner, Rhenferd, Reland, Du Pin, Bellarmine, Baronius, Grotius, Casaubon, Richard Simon, Tillemont, Calmet, Martianay, Pouget, Vallarsi, Maffei, Alber, Adler, Halfeld, J. E. C. Schmidt, Elsner, Corrodi, Vossius, Hänlein, Michaelis, Storr, Bolten, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Weber, Kuinoel, Olshausen, Neander, Tholuck, Sieffert, Meyer, Ebrard, Mill, Cave, Hammond, Walton, Pritius, Kidder, Williams, Scott, Harwood, Dr. H. Owen, Marsh, Tomline, A. Clarke, Campbell, Greswell, Norton, Davidson.

On the other hand, the *Greek* original has been advocated by many in the last three centuries. Several of these were Protestants, who deemed this necessary on the dogmatic ground of the perfectness of Scripture. On this point Erasmus has been followed by Œcolampadius, Cajetan, Calvin, Paræus, Flacius, Beza, Gerhard, Walther, Walæus, Heidegger, Chamier, Lightfoot, Calovius, Hottinger, Kortholdt, Ittig, Le Clerc, Cappell, Beausobre, Basnage, Rumpæus, Schrœder, Maius, Lardner, Fabritius, Leusden, Vogel, C. F. Schmidt, Hoffman, Pfeiffer, Boerner, Wetstein, Masch, Schubert, Gabler, Paulus, Kœcher, Semler, Venema, Noesselt, Jeremiah Jones, Jortin, Hey, Edelman, Hug,

[1] Bishop Marsh has well remarked on the endeavour to invalidate the testimony of the *chain* of witnesses to the Hebrew original. He says:—'It is the duty of those who reject the evidence of Irenæus to prove that it rests only on the authority of Papias, and it is very unjust to require, from those who admit it, a proof to the contrary. Were this demand admitted, the testimonies of the ancients would be so curtailed as to be reduced almost to nothing; for it would be allowable in no instance whatsoever to quote more than *one* ancient writer in favour of the same fact, if the bare *possibility* that the testimony of the one was nothing more than the echo of the testimony given by the other, were a sufficient reason for rejecting that testimony.'—*Translation of Michaelis*, vol. iii. pt. ii. pp. 111, 112.

Fritzsche,

Digitized by Google

Fritzsche, Moldenhawer, Wiser, Harles, Hewlett, Moses Stuart, Bleek.[k]

While giving these lists of names, I protest against *names* deciding such a question; many may have followed one another; *truth* must be sought on a very different ground than that of mere authority.

There is a *third* theory which must be mentioned, by which an endeavour has been made to unite conflicting opinions. Some have felt that they could not resist the force of *evidence* for the Hebrew original, and yet they have thought that the arguments in favour of the Greek were very weighty: they have said, all external testimony is in favour of the Hebrew, all internal evidence in favour of the Greek. They have therefore received *both* opinions, supposing that St. Matthew first wrote his Gospel in Hebrew for the Jewish Christians, and at a later period rendered it into Greek for the Gentiles. This theory is an attempt to evade difficulties, and as such I will not deny it the praise due to ingenuity; but it lacks one essential ingredient—*evidence*. This evidence is *not* supplied by the fact that the early writers who attest the Hebrew, yet use the Greek as authoritative; for they do this avowing the Greek *not* to be original: they do not hint that it also proceeded from the pen of St. Matthew.

Hence I consider this *reconciling* theory to be quite inadmissible. Its advocates, however, agree with what I have said as to the character of the evidence in favour of the Hebrew—it has a weight which they cannot reject. They are also rejecters of the *dogmatic* ground for asserting simply a Greek original; for they do hold that an inspired book—St. Matthew in Hebrew—has not been preserved. Their opinion that our Greek Gospel looks like an original is one which I can quite understand, but which can, I believe, be fully accounted for without the adoption of this somewhat curious theory. It does in fact seem rather strange to me to think of Matthew himself as the translator, and that too without one particle of ancient evidence. Later writers have *conjectured* who the translator might be; but I feel constrained to abide by the statement of Jerome, 'We do not know who afterwards translated it into Greek.'

This theory of a twofold original was, I believe, first suggested by Sixtus Senensis, and it has been mentioned as *more* or *less* probable by Schwarz, Bengel, Guerike, Schott, Whitby, Townson, Benson, Hales, Horne, Bloomfield, Thiersch, Kitto.

[k] The names of those who maintain the opposite opinions have been taken in part from Marsh's Michaelis, the Rev. T. H. Horne, and Dr. Davidson; the lists might be greatly extended.

An

Digitized by Google

An attack has been recently made, not merely on the opinion that the original language of St. Matthew's Gospel was Hebrew, but also upon the witnesses themselves who attest that such was the fact, and also on those who now credit their evidence. This attack calls for remark simply because of the strong *assertions* of the writer.

The assailant of the ancient opinion on the subject writes in a Scottish monthly contemporary (September, 1849), and he uses a notice of Dr. Davidson's Introduction to the four Gospels as the occasion of bringing forward his *assertions*. Dr. Davidson's statements are thus attacked :—

'We much regret that Dr. Davidson should have gone into the notion that the first Gospel, as we have it in Greek, is not the genuine work of Matthew, but only a translation of that work. This seems to us a very serious matter, nothing less than the expunging of one of the inspired records of our Lord's life on earth; for if we follow patristic tradition in this matter, we must take the whole case as the witnesses depone to it; and they state as distinctly that the translator was a person utterly unknown, and that he has sometimes made mistakes, as they state that the original language of the Gospel of Matthew was in Hebrew. But if this be true, what confidence can be placed in the Gospel as we now have it? A translation made by nobody knows who, and manifestly incorrect! of what worth is it as a canon of divine and infallible truth?

'Dr. Davidson treats this view of the subject rather summarily. He speaks of the Greek translation as "presenting *substantially* the authentic Gospel of Matthew the Apostle," and avows his "conviction of the *virtual* inspiration possessed by the writer to whom we owe the present Greek Gospel." This seems to us strange language. What the author means by *virtual* inspiration we cannot conjecture; and what kind of conviction he can have of the inspiration of a writer *who makes blunders*, we are equally at a loss to conceive. As for this supposed translation presenting the *substance* of the Gospel of the Apostle, the same may be said of any of the lives of Christ which have been framed in modern times by pious writers. Are we, therefore, to bow to them as to inspired men, and receive all they have written as Apostolic?

'And on what evidence are we asked to give up this sacred book? On evidence, we venture to say, such as would not be admitted into any court of law to decide the pettiest case of litigation. Of all the witnesses Dr. Davidson adduces, only one says that he had ever seen the Hebrew Gospel, and one or two professedly quote it: all the rest either simply say that Matthew wrote a Gospel in Hebrew, or say that somebody told them so. The one who says he had seen the Gospel is Jerome; but his evidence about it is so conflicting that it is not worth a rush. First he says he has seen it, and is sure that it is the original of the Greek Gospel; then he softens down into "it *is called* by most people Matthew's authentic," "as most believe," and so on: now he says, "who translated it into Greek is unknown;" and presently, with amusing self-complacency and obliviousness, he tells us, "I myself translated it into Greek and Latin!" Why there is not a small-debt court in the country where such a witness would not be hooted to the door! And yet this is Dr. Davidson's most important witness in a matter involving the most awful issues!'[m]

[m] May I be allowed to expostulate with the editor of the periodical in question for the inadvertence which he has shown in permitting such a production to appear in its pages? Could he have *read* it himself before it was printed?

To

Digitized by Google

To prevent all possible charge of misrepresentation, I have cited the statement of the assailant thus at length: had I not done so, some would have thought that the *assertions* on which I have to remark *could* not have been such as they *are*. I leave for the present the remarks which are directed against Dr. Davidson, and confine myself to the attack on Jerome. An endeavour has been made to represent Jerome's sense or his veracity in a very unfavourable light. But how stand the *facts*? Do the fragmentary citations present his testimony *fairly*? Look at the words of Jerome himself as they have been given above: he is speaking of St. Matthew's Gospel which Christians had been using in Greek for three hundred years; he says that it was written in Hebrew by the Apostle, but that who translated it into Greek is unknown. There is no ambiguity here. In another place (just before) he speaks of the Hebrew copy (with some interpolations) which he had obtained from Berœa; and he says that he had translated *this* document himself into Greek and Latin. I entreat the writer to re-examine what Jerome really said.

There is no discrepancy (as has been shown above) between the sentiments of Jerome as to the Hebrew document which he obtained from Berœa; he considered it to be the Hebrew gospel of St. Matthew, but he also considered the Text to be not very pure. But indeed it is needless to comment on the assailant's assertions on this head. A writer who can use the words of Jerome, so as to *allege* that he speaks of a translation circulated in Greek for three hundred years *as made by himself*, may easily mistake as to matters of opinion. Had Jerome said what the assailant represents, 'self-complacency' and 'obliviousness' would be mild accusations indeed: his *sanity* ought rather to have been called in question.

And such allegations against Jerome are made the basis of invective! His evidence is said to be 'not worth a rush;'—it is affirmed that if he appeared as witness in a small-debt court he would be 'hooted to the door.' I wish to assure this writer that it is not the custom to treat witnesses in such a manner; they are *heard*, not *hooted* at, and their evidence is *weighed*. Is there any court which would not protect a witness from rude treatment? Are not Jerome's age and character entitled to command civility at least?[n]

To

[n] Should the remarks of the assailant (by any peculiar accident) happen to meet the eye of any foreigner, what idea would he form of our 'courts of law'? What an idea that on any principle a witness should be *uncivilly* 'hooted to the door'! The assailant has thus sought to treat Jerome, the witness in the present cause.

But

Digitized by Google

To affirm that evidence is conflicting will not make it so. To say that a man writes incoherently and falsely, will not convince those who can see that his words have been tortured and twisted: if the sentences quoted from Jerome to make him seem to say that he did not know who had translated St. Matthew into Greek, and yet that he had done it himself, be considered *fair* and straightforward quotation, then will it be permitted to take any two sentences from the same writer, place them in juxtaposition, and charge him with the consequences. But if these modes of procedure are *not* such as can be used to elicit *truth*, then I ask what judgment must be formed of this attack?

I do not wish to judge this writer too harshly. There are these two alternatives—1st, that he is acquainted with Jerome's works; and that wittingly and intentionally he falsified the citations from Jerome, in order to (apparently) overwhelm Dr. Davidson's arguments by destroying the credibility of his witness: 2ndly, that the writer is *wholly* ignorant of what Jerome really wrote, and that he actually could imagine that Jerome wrote such things as he has alleged. I do not hesitate to suppose the latter alternative to be the true one. I willingly acquit the writer of all *intentional* misrepresentation and invention; there are circumstances which render it in my opinion *impossible*.° He had a cause to advocate, and he had not that knowledge of the facts of the case, and the value of the evidence, which would enable him to defend his opinion on tenable grounds; he has thus plunged into a region with which he was unacquainted.

But he has not driven him out of court, and his evidence remains fully unimpeached. But, indeed, this peculiar style of civil treatment for witnesses in a 'court of law,' explains the mode in which this writer upholds a cause and conducts a controversy.

An attack under the shelter of an incognito ought to be sustained by unexceptionable evidence: *argument*, if sound, is valid whoever may use it; the worth of *assertions*, however, very much depends on the credit of him from whom they come. An anonymous writer ought, therefore, to produce his voucher for every statement that he uses when attacking others.

° The reason *why* this is impossible is illustrated by the following anecdote of Lord William Paulet, who lived about 180 years ago. A libellous book had been published, in which considerable ability was displayed; a gentleman, however, who was offended by the contents, charged Lord William with being the author, and challenged him in consequence to fight a duel. Lord William was a pious man, and had the moral courage to refuse to fight: he offered to certify solemnly that he was not the author of the book; this offer was accepted, and Lord William took a pen and wrote thus:—'*This is two scratify that i did not rit the bok*'—'Stop, stop, my lord (cried the gentleman), I am quite satisfied that your Lordship COULD not have been the author.'

Lord William Paulet, too, had speculations about St. Matthew's Gospel. He asked, one day, 'Who wrote St. Matthew's Gospel?' Some wag replied, 'Why, don't you know? Sir Matthew Hale, to be sure.' This was duly believed by Lord William, whose piety went beyond his sense; and in his will he left Sir Matthew Hale 500*l. for having composed so godly a treatise.*

All

Digitized by Google

All men are liable to make mistakes; but if any one chooses to write on a subject with which he is not acquainted, he ought at least not to be betrayed by his own want of knowledge into making charges and accusations against others. If a man is not conscious of his own ignorance, how often may it lead him into mischief: but if he is aware that he does require information, he will be kept from running onward in a reckless course. This assailant stands, then, charged on the simplest evidence with ignorantly misstating Jerome's testimony, and (in consequence) with speaking contumeliously of Jerome, and *thus* misrepresenting Dr. Davidson's facts, arguments, and opinions.

I believe that no one will deny that this assailant is GUILTY of the misrepresentation with which I have charged him: *if not*, then it must follow that Jerome did assert that he was himself the person who executed a translation, made (as he elsewhere says) by a person unknown, and in use for three hundred years and more! [p]

Of course, if Jerome is thus treated, Origen and other witnesses are likely to have their words twisted in the same manner. And Dr. Davidson may share with others in the attack, and on just as tenable grounds. It is wholly erroneous to think that the *evidence* of the mass of the early Christian writers is to be treated as nothing, and got rid of by one remark—'all the rest simply say that Matthew wrote a Gospel in Hebrew, or say that somebody told them so.' This mode of reasoning will satisfy no one who desires really to know what testimony is, and who is capable of appreciating it when presented.

I have said that there are circumstances which to my mind render *intentional* misrepresentation impossible; this is shown, I think, from the fact that detection was so certain. If a man presents a forged bank-note so clumsily executed that any child could see that it is not genuine, we acquit him of the evil design of uttering a forgery knowing it to be such; but we do this at the expense of his understanding and power of discernment. But, in the present case, the assailant has laid himself open to a yet farther charge than that of mere ignorance; he has shown *almost incredible carelessness;* he had Dr. Davidson's volume before him; and from it he seems to have drawn the sentences from Jerome. And yet he has shown (to use his own terms) such 'amusing self-complacency and obliviousness,' as to draw his conclusions first, and then force the evidence to suit, and to over-

[p] In other words, that he made a translation long before his birth! Had Jerome really written this, he would have deserved all that this writer says of him: *but not else.*

look

Digitized by Google

look the plain words which were legibly printed in Latin, and in *English* also, before his eyes.

Resolutely as this writer has attacked Dr. Davidson in the sentences with which my citation commenced, I believe that no reader of these remarks of mine (unless it be the assailant himself) will think that it is *very* probable that the assault is altogether fair. They will be inclined to pause, even if they have not seen his volume; for they will say that if any one could impeach Jerome's credibility, by making him say what he never said, it is most probable that he has treated another in the same manner. At least, if he did not, it would be strangely inconsistent on his part; for Dr. Davidson is the party assailed, and Jerome only shares in his assault, from being one of the witnesses. And, in simple fact, this is the case. The assailant equally misrepresents Dr. Davidson and Jerome; and he owes an apology to each.

I suppose that I shall hardly be expected formally to deny that Dr. Davidson ever asserted such irreverent nonsense as that which the assailant charges him with. Who will believe that he, or any other Christian man or Christian minister, professed to believe in 'the inspiration of a writer who makes blunders?' The first point to be *proved* is, that the writer, or *translator* (begging the assailant's pardon), did make blunders. If inspired, he made none. What does the assailant mean by saying that the witnesses state that the translator of St. Matthew into Greek '*sometimes made mistakes?*' *Who* are the witnesses who affirm this? I feel little inclined to believe such a thing on the mere *ipse dixit* of this writer. If there be proof that the witnesses state this, I ask to be shown the distinct, definite, and undoubted passages in which they say so. If no such passages be found, then this assailant stands with yet more inaccuracy of assertion charged against him. He has come into court as a witness; he is entitled to a hearing; he has received it as to Jerome; and his testimony is false (not wittingly and knowingly so): his testimony therefore in a similar case is justly suspected.

And to call the Greek translator 'a writer who makes blunders,'[q] and to speak of the translation as 'manifestly incorrect,'—what

[q] The only thing which Dr. Davidson has said which I can imagine capable of being alleged as a ground for the charge of 'making blunders,' is a remark (p. 45) on the connection of the citation in Matt. xii. 20, with the Hebrew of Isaiah. Recourse has been had to the Syro-Chaldaic, as affording a connection between לָאֱמֶת in the prophet, and *εἰς νῖκος* in the Evangelist. But to talk of *blunders* here! Probably the assailant does not know that old Puritan writers supposed *εἰς νῖκος* to stand in the New Testament as a Hebraism, signifying 'for ever,' answering to the Hebrew לָנֶצַח. (See the English-Greek Lexicon, published and recommended by Joseph Caryll,

Digitized by Google

what does it avail (when asserted *without evidence*) but to raise prejudice in the minds of the uninformed? They are told of 'a lion without' (Prov. xxii. 13): they must, however, resemble the assailant himself if they are much alarmed.

I do not *here* remark on the connection between the Hebrew gospel as written by Matthew and the authoritative Greek Translation, which the Church at large has always possessed from the first century and onwards. I shall afterwards take up this subject, and then perhaps the reader will see that the phrase 'virtual inspiration' is not quite as unintelligible as the assailant supposes. I trust, however, that I have already said enough to show that the *assertions* and *opinions* of this writer equally require to be examined.

He speaks of Dr. Davidson's 'witnesses' as if quoting the Hebrew Gospel without having seen it: 'only one says that he had ever seen the Hebrew Gospel, and one or two professedly quote it.' I had supposed that it was customary to see a book before one cited from it; I actually had thought that if a person quoted from a work, it might be supposed that he had seen it: but now, as I am open to conviction, I have been taught to renounce this opinion. This writer does not consider this acquaintance with a book to be necessary as a qualification for quoting from it; *and he has acted on this opinion:* THIS explains at once the manner in which he has treated Jerome and others. He has '*professedly quoted*' from them, but not actually examined their writings.

In speaking of Origen, this writer mentions one of the passages

---

Caryll, Henry Jessey, &c., 1661.) But, perhaps, this writer would charge them with accusing the inspired writers of the New Testament with 'making blunders.'

There is a passage, however, in Jerome's *Epistola ad Hedibiam* (Vallarsi I., cxx.) which this assailant might look on as a *prize*. He had better, however, take care of *seizing* it as such, for he would find it just as such a prize as the *bait* is to the fish; he would fasten himself on the hook. Jerome is answering questions on difficulties connected with the Gospels: the question here considered is how in Matt. xxviii. 1 there is '*vespere* autem sabbati,' and in John xx. 1, '*una* autem sabbati.' The solution turns wholly on the sense of the Greek ὀψέ. But Jerome says, 'Mihique videtur Evangelista Matthæus qui Evangelium Hebraico sermone conscripsit, non tam *vespere* dixisse, quam *sero;* et eum qui interpretatus est, verbi ambiguitate deceptum, non *sero* interpretatum esse, sed *vespere*.' What! does not this fully bear out the charge of making blunders? What else can be made of 'verbi ambiguitate deceptum?' It would be easy thus to triumph without examination: this would be swallowing the bait; but the hook is sharp and the line strong. But not to leave the assailant the opportunity of being caught, I will fairly put him on his guard as to the whole state of the case. Jerome here follows Eusebius (*Quæstiones ad Marinum*, Mai Collectio Vaticana, vol. i.). Eusebius discussed the whole question in connection with ὀψέ; he takes it somewhat in the sense of our English version. Jerome has a greater difficulty to meet, because of the Latin rendering 'vespere:' the point he has to consider is the translation into *Latin*, and he only refers to the Hebrew original to confirm his argument. Eusebius drew the *result* from the Greek *only*, to which 'verbi ambiguitate *deceptum*' cannot apply.

which

Digitized by Google

which had been interpolated into the Hebrew Gospel. After giving the words, 'My mother, the Holy Ghost, took me lately by one of the hairs of my head, and carried me to Mount Tabor,' he says, 'Think of such an abomination as this being passed on us as part of Matthew's genuine original gospel.' Think of it indeed! But *who* tries to pass it as genuine? Does he mean to assert that Dr. Davidson does so? Possibly not; and yet his words give that idea. Against whom does he direct this insinuation? Against Dr. Davidson, or against Origen, or against the whole mass of the ancient Christians and many in modern times, who believe that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew?

If an inquirer wholly uninformed on the subject were to read the paper of this assailant, he would of course think that the Hebrew original of St. Matthew was some new and dangerous idea which was quite peculiar to Dr. Davidson. Why has he omitted all mention of the fact that this was the *only* opinion for fourteen hundred years, and that many mature scholars and eminent Christians in modern times have been of exactly the same opinion, and that, too, without perceiving any of the terrible consequences which this writer would deduce from it? Was he ignorant of this fact, or has he suppressed it? The former, no doubt.

This writer indeed can say :—

'It is bad enough, on such evidence, to be asked to give up a sacred book, but this is but a small part of the mischief resulting from the ground taken by the advocates of this opinion. If their conclusion he correct, our confidence in the entire body of the New Testament writings is shaken. We receive these on the ground of their reception as canonical by the early Church, and this ground we regard as strong, because of the care which the early Christians took to discriminate between the genuine and the spurious of those books which were in circulation. But if this hypothesis, that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, and somebody translated it into Greek, be received, then in what position do we find ourselves as to confidence in the discrimination and sincerity of the early Church? So little, it would appear, had they of regard for genuine apostolic writings, that they allowed one of them to be irrecoverably lost after they had it in their hands, whilst they retained an imperfect version of it, executed by nobody knows who! That they should have done this is quite incredible; but this they must have done, if the hypothesis espoused by Dr. Davidson be correct; and if they did this their testimony in favour of the New Testament canon is shaken to the foundation.'

I answer, *first*, no one suggests (except this writer) that we should 'give up a sacred book:' *secondly*, on *the same ground* on which we receive the New Testament Scriptures as genuine (namely early testimony), ought we to believe in the Hebrew original of St. Matthew:[r] *thirdly*, that the fact is that the early Christians *did*

[r] This assailant seems to have forgotten that he said just before—'If we follow patristic tradition in this matter we must take the whole case as the witnesses depone to

Digitized by Google

did believe in the Hebrew original, and yet they did not preserve it. Let this be deemed 'quite incredible,' yet it is as much *a fact* as it is that this writer has made such 'incredible' remarks. The point, observe, for the force of this argument is not, Did St. Matthew write in Hebrew? but, Did the early Christians *believe* that he did so? They did so believe; and yet this book which they regarded as a genuine apostolic writing is *irrecoverably lost;* unless indeed the assailant, who thinks such a loss impossible, will demonstrate that it *must exist*, therefore it *does exist*, and then will complete the proof, by producing it.

It would be easy to draw conclusions, and to dilate on the consequences which would result from the opinions of the assailant: how easy is it to turn his own words back on himself. 'If this hypothesis that Matthew did NOT write his gospel in Hebrew be received, then in what position do we find ourselves as to confidence in the discrimination and sincerity of the early Church?' If the evidence of credible witnesses to the Hebrew original of St. Matthew be rejected, would it not weaken the testimony of these same writers as to the entire body of the New Testament Scriptures?

The fearful results which this assailant supposes would follow the rejection of *his* hypothesis, may be safely left as arising from his own misconceptions.*

I have now done with this assailant. There are Biblical scholars whom I am bound to respect, who deny the Hebrew original of St. Matthew; and I should deeply regret if any of my remarks should be supposed by any one to be directed against them. I know, however, that they cannot covet the advocacy of the paper in question. No one injures a cause more thoroughly than an advocate, who heaps assertion on assertion, who misquotes and misrepresents all opposing evidence, and then assuming a high moral tone, points out the fearful consequences which must follow, if *his* conclusions be not received. Such an advocate may carry uninformed minds with him for the moment; but let it once be demonstrated that his premises are false, and then his conclusions fall. Nay further, *even if* a TRUTH be *thus* advocated, so soon

to it:' how would this writer prove that St. Matthew wrote a Gospel at all? By early testimony (*I* would not say 'patristic tradition'): but let him take (as he says) 'the whole case as the witnesses depone to it,' and we find the Hebrew original and the anonymous Greek translation also proved!

* This writer triumphs over Dr. Davidson because he once advocated the Greek original. If he thinks that a determination to maintain an opinion at all risks is a mark of a great mind, he is utterly and lamentably mistaken. Whoever desires to advance in the knowledge of *truth* must be willing to reject his preconceived opinions, when good evidence shows their futility. If I learn that I have mistaken as to a point either of fact or opinion, I hope that I may have the sense to be willing to be taught, for I remember what human infirmity is.

Digitized by Google

as the fallacious groundwork is cut away, there is always danger lest it be supposed that the false foundation is the true one, on which that truth is based.

To all scholars the treatment of Jerome's testimony carries its own condemnation on its head; to all students of the Bible, the *conclusions* of this writer are equally futile; for they know that his alarming consequences are the creations of mere imagination. Surely the Biblical scholarship of *Scotland* must be very far above such displays of the *absence of erudition*: the critics of that country must be far too well versed in Biblical studies to allow such statements to pass current, as though they possessed either candour or profundity.[t] I shall not feel myself bound to notice any further remarks of this writer, unless he stands forth in his own proper person, and with a frank acknowledgment of having inadvertently misrepresented Jerome and others. *All are liable to make mistakes;* but this is no reason for persisting in a mistake after it has been pointed out.[u]

A remark is needed also on a passage in a review of Dr. Davidson's first volume in the American *Bibliotheca Sacra*. This review I suppose to be from the pen of Professor Edwards, one of the editors of that periodical. It is like breathing fresh air to get away from the mists raised by the assailant of whom I have recently spoken, to a writer, who, while he upholds the Greek original, does so by fair statements. He mentions Dr. Davidson's conclusion in favour of the Hebrew original, and then says:—

'We confess that we are not quite prepared to accede to this conclusion. The external evidence is in favour of a Syro-Chaldaic original; the internal evidence is against it. The Greek Gospel certainly bears all the marks of an original. And if Matthew wrote a Syro-Chaldaic Gospel, possessing, of course, apostolic authority, a trustworthy history of our Lord, from an eye-witness, it is very remarkable that this Gospel should perish so suddenly, that there should be no hint in regard to its fortunes in the Fathers, that they should

[t] To all Scotch students of the Bible I would recommend especially the remarks on the Hebrew original of St. Matthew in Principal Campbell on the Gospels.

[u] Porson knew how to distinguish between respectable scholars who had upheld the genuineness of 1 John v. 7, and reckless asserters like Travis. So would I distinguish between such men as Hug, Moses Stuart, and Professor Edwards (men whose statements are at least worth weighing), and this writer.

Mill and Bengel are mentioned in Porson's pages with the deference due to such scholars: but as to *Travis*, he concludes his letter thus:—'You may, therefore, reply, Sir, or not, as shall seem good to you. If you think proper not to expose yourself again, which, to speak as a friend, I should think your wisest plan, I shall attribute your silence to a consciousness of your own weakness. . . . But if you reply . . . . I shall be perfectly silent, unless you can disprove the charges that I have brought against you, of ignorance and misrepresentation. . . . If you confess the charges, and yet maintain that the errors you have committed are venial and consistent with a knowledge of the subject, I shall excuse myself from the controversy, and consider you as degraded from that rank of literature which entitles one writer to challenge another.'

fail

Digitized by Google

fail to quote it, that there should be no legend whatever with regard to its fate. Then if some other person had translated the Syro-Chaldaic Gospel into Greek, either with or without Matthew's sanction, why is there no allusion to it? The Fathers are quite careful to report the sanction which Mark's Gospel receives from his connection with Peter, and Luke's from his relation to Paul. But there is a profound silence in relation to Matthew and his translator.' (*Bib. Sac. May*, 1849, p. 361.)

These sentiments are, I believe, current amongst American Biblical scholars; but if they would reweigh the whole subject, if they would not allow the reception of *evidence* to be controlled by mere subjective feelings, surely not a few of them would fully adopt the conclusion in favour of a Hebrew original. I have previously remarked on the questions which are here suggested: I have shown that what the Fathers *believed* to be the original of St. Matthew, they did not in fact preserve, and that there are hints as to the Hebrew original up to the fifth century. A profound silence as to *who* was the translator of St. Matthew, does not invalidate testimony that it was a translation.

The subject would be imperfectly treated, if I were not, in conclusion, to make some remarks on the authoritative character of the Greek gospel which we possess. If this point be demonstrated, what remains of those *fears* which are allowed to hinder the reception of the attested fact of the Hebrew original? If we possess an *authoritative* Greek gospel, why need the most timid shrink from believing, with all the ancients, that it is translated from the Hebrew which Matthew wrote?

Some have, indeed, thought the idea of an *authoritative translation* self contradictory. But this is only one form of dogmatic *à priori* argument: it is said that God may inspire an original writing; but an *inspired translation*, an authoritative version, is supposed to involve some incongruity. But why so? Can any of us say that he has penetrated into the Divine mind? Can we tell *how* God acted in the inspiration of Scripture? Can we say how it becomes Him to act? Unless we can affirm these things, we must not hastily reject the possibility of authoritative, inspired translation.

Now we do possess inspired translations: the Scripture abounds with them. Are not the discourses of our Lord parts of inspired Scripture? Yet he spoke in Hebreo-Chaldaic, and the Holy Ghost has recorded His words in Greek. Here then is translation—inspired translation—received as authoritative by all who receive the Bible. Sometimes the pen of inspiration expressly tells us that words were spoken in Hebrew, and then gives them in Greek: is not this a pretty plain intimation that inspired translation is not inconsistent with the ways of God? Again, in cita-

Digitized by Google

tions from the Old Testament, in places not a few, the inspired Apostles give their own version from the Hebrew and not that of the LXX.; to say that this is not inspired translation, is the same thing as denying the inspiration of the New Testament altogether.

How then was the Greek gospel which we possess, received and used in early times?

If we look at the middle of the second century, we shall find that all the four gospels in Greek were then in general acceptance and public use, *wherever* Christian communities were formed amongst those who spoke that language.

JUSTIN MARTYR, in his first Apology addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, thus describes the worship of the Christians. He says:—

'On the day called Sunday, there is an assembly in one place of all who dwell in the cities or in the country, and the memorials of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read, as time may permit. Afterwards, when he who reads has ended, he who presides admonishes and exhorts by word to imitate these good things. Afterwards, we all stand up together and pray; and, as we said before, when we have made an end of prayer, bread is brought, and wine and water, and he who presides offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people add their assent, saying, *Amen;* and those things for which thanks were given are distributed, and are partaken of by each one; and they are sent by the deacons to those who are not present. Those who are well off and who wish it, contribute, each one according to his own purpose, what he wishes, and the collection is deposited with him who presides; and he assists orphans and widows, and those who are in need through sickness or other cause, and those who are in bonds, and strangers who may be sojourning in the place; and, in fact, he takes care of all who may be in need.

'We all hold this united assembly on Sunday, since it is the first day, in which God turned aside darkness and matter and made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day arose from the dead; for they crucified him the day before Saturday, and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, he was manifested to his apostles and disciples, and taught them things which we have offered likewise for your attention.'

Here Justin lays before the emperor and his colleagues a plain account of Christian worship such as was practised in the middle of the second century wherever Christians were found. He speaks of things which were manifest matters of fact. When Melanchthon drew up the Augsburg Confession, he says, on behalf of those who presented it, '*Ecclesiæ magno consensu apud nos docent;*'—'The Churches amongst us teach with general consent;'—the circumstances under which the Confession was presented, vouch for the accuracy of the facts alleged. It was not a thing which depended on Melanchthon's evidence, but a thing which was openly known. So too here: Justin's testimony is a statement on behalf of all the Christian communities, and the nature of the public facts alleged authenticates them.

The

Digitized by Google

The 'Memorials of the Apostles' were then in weekly public use amongst the Christians in the middle of the second century; and Justin in the sentence immediately preceding the one which I have cited above, says, 'the Apostles in the Memorials which they have made which are called *Gospels*;' and in another place he says, 'The Memorials which were drawn up by the Apostles and their companions.' In another passage he uses the term gospel in the singular, designating apparently the collective volume.

Accordingly we find several passages cited from the 'Memorials of the Apostles' which coincide in the general with our four canonical gospels, especially with that of St. Matthew. It is true that he nowhere names the authors, nor yet does he say that the collected volume contained *four* gospels; but that *his* gospels were the same as ours may be known, even if we had not proof that the contents correspond.

For Irenæus, who was in part a contemporary of Justin, speaks in such plain and decided terms of the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John as alone used by the whole Church under heaven, that even opposers of their authenticity are compelled to admit, that, in the latter half of the second century, our four canonical gospels were in general use. If then these are not the gospels intended by Justin, it would follow that all the Christians every where *changed* their gospels, and that they changed them in the same manner; and that this was done without our possessing the slightest hint or intimation of so remarkable a simultaneous proceeding. Had the Christians in Egypt been inclined to use some new documents as the genuine works of the Apostles, how can it be supposed that those of Syria and Italy would at the same time do precisely the same thing? And yet this must be assumed, if the gospels which Justin mentions as in general use, were not the same as those spoken of by Irenæus and others. And farther this *change* must have happened in Irenæus's days, and yet it is not noticed by him or by opposing heretics!

Thus then it follows that Justin speaks of our four Gospels as being in his day in universal use amongst Christians: of these four Gospels (as we learn from others) three were known and received as original productions in Greek; and the other, which stands at the head of the collection, a translation from a Hebrew original. All, however, were used as equally authentic; the same appeals were made to all; and this, at least, showed the judgment then formed of the translation of the first. In this age we find no trace of the use of *separate* Gospels: a collection had been formed, and that at a sufficiently early time for all the churches to possess it; and all had the translated Matthew placed at the head of the volume.

Digitized by Google

volume. These things could not have been recent when Justin wrote.

Thus Justin carries us yet farther back than his own time; and yet he must have been a Christian at least about the year 130; so that on no principle of supposition can we avoid carrying the effect of his testimony back to several years before that date. If a *custom* be proved to exist at any given time *as a custom*, the effect of the proof is to show that it must have originated at least some time before.

Justin Martyr lived pretty near the Apostolic age. One man, Polycarp, connected Irenæus with the Apostle John; how many then must there not have been who were contemporaries of that apostle, and also of Justin. Ephesus was one of the places at which Justin sojourned in the course of his extensive travels; that was the very place where St. John had spent his latter years, and where he died. The old Christians of that place, when Justin visited it, were the middle-aged ones of the time of St. John; the middle-aged ones of Justin's days were the young of the time of the Apostle. Had they changed every custom from that which had existed in the Apostle's life-time? Had they in this time made any alteration as to the use of books which they believed to be sacred? The difficulties in the way of such an hypothesis are greater if applied to this time, even than if we take a later period. We thus find ourselves brought back even to the Apostolic age.[x] We learn that the same Gospel-collection must have been used, and that publicly, in the Christian communities—that the very nature of the case prevented the possibility of an universal change; and the only question left is, What *sanction* did this custom possess? To this but one answer can (I believe) be given: It must have been done by Apostolic authority. The Church from the very time of the Apostle John used *his* Gospel, in connection with the three others, in their habitual weekly worship.

If then we trace the Gospel-collection in Greek to the Apostolic age, we find that the Greek translation of St. Matthew belongs to that period, and whatever authenticates the collection authenticates that version.

And even if we look at the Greek copy of Matthew by itself we see that it must belong to the Apostolic age. The line of early writers who cite and use it, carry us back in the same way as they do with regard to Mark, Luke, and John. The language too

[x] Justin lived and wrote *nearer* to the Apostolic age than we are to the time of the old French Revolution. And yet how many are there still who connect us with that period and all its consequences. I have myself seen and conversed this very year (1849) with old soldiers of all Napoleon's campaigns. Justin might have known *far more* who were contemporaries with the Apostles: indeed very many such must have been still living when he wrote.

shows

Digitized by Google

shows its origin as plainly as does that of the other three Gospels. It must have been translated[y] at a pretty early period, and evidently by some Hebrew Christian; this alone would show the Apostolic sanction of the version; for without this the bodies of Greek Christians everywhere would not *with one accord* have received the book.

In the Apostolic age the Greek version must have been made: in that age the churches received it. There were then in the Church authoritative teachers, and the churches could no more have received with one consent a doubtful translation of an Apostolic writing than they could have received a spurious book.

Thus we find that the same line of proof which demonstrates that St. Matthew wrote a Gospel requires us to admit that he wrote it in Hebrew; and yet farther the same line of proof authenticates the Greek translation which we have as an authoritative document. Its being a version does in no way detract from this *authority*, for this is the very form in which it was received by the bodies of Gentile Christians even in the Apostolic age. Nor need any difficulty be raised by us, because we do not know *who* translated it; if the earliest writers knew, at least they have not informed us; the translator has (so to speak) been kept quite out of sight; we look simply to the time when the Church possessed Apostolic guidance, and we see that the version then came forth to the Church; we recognize God as the giver of this book in Hebrew by the pen of Matthew, and we also recognize His care in giving us an apostolically sanctioned version, though from whose pen we know not.

The early Christians used this Greek Gospel with all confidence: they argued on its words and expressions (even when avowing it to be a version) in exactly the same manner as they did those of the other three Gospels, originally written in Greek. Why should not we use it with similar confidence?

As to the *Canonical authority* of the Greek Gospel which we possess, no further proof need (I believe) be given: we have the same evidence for this Greek translation which we possess for the original Greek documents written by Mark, Luke, and John. All four were used together by the Church from the earliest days; all four have the same sanction.

---

[y] The words of Papias (or rather his informant, John the Presbyter)—'Matthew indeed wrote the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, but every one *interpreted* them as he was able,'—have no relation to the Greek version which the Churches received: συνεγράψατο and ἡρμήνευσε stand in the same tense; reference is made to a time long past. Matthew wrote in the Hebrew dialect; there was then no Greek authoritative Gospel, and thus the Hebrew document was used by each to the best of his ability. No such idea can be entertained as that this was a practice at the end of the first century.

But

Digitized by Google

But what shall be said as to the *inspiration* of our Greek Matthew? The original Hebrew document was, of course, inspired. To write Scripture was an Apostolic endowment. The Apostles were also the authoritative trainers of the Church; if they sanctioned a translation of an inspired document, that sanction would give it such an authority as would amount to *virtual inspiration*. But the early Christians used it confidently as an inspired work, and that in the fullest sense, even when they affirmed it to be a version: they thus received it as actually inspired. And so too may we; for why should translation hinder this? We may hold the highest views of inspiration, and yet admit that a version may be inspired.[a] St. Paul rarely wrote with his own hand; and yet we do not doubt the full authority of all his Epistles; we do not say that Tertius and others may have erred in writing down his words. The Spirit of God, by whom Paul dictated his Epistles (so that he could say, 'The things that *I* write unto you are the commandments of the *Lord*'), no doubt guarded Tertius, or any other amanuensis, from all possible mistake: *He* gave forth the Scripture, and He, too, provided all the means by which this should be done infallibly. We have only to apply similar principles to the case before us; just as the early Churches received St. Paul's Epistles, even when there was no certainty by whose pen they had been written; so do we receive this Gospel of St. Matthew, although we know not by whose hand it was put into Greek.

This subject is no mere curious speculation or idle inquiry. The early Christians knew something of the criteria of the authority of ancient works. Thus Augustine lays down that if from the time of any writer there be a continuous chain of witnesses

---

[a] I speak of inspiration in its highest sense. I have no wish now to discuss the subject of inspiration; I may, however, refer to Dr. Eadie's *Biblical Cyclopædia*. He says:—'Inspiration must be full or plenary. The message must come to us as wholly God's, without any human admixture. . . . Words and thoughts are so closely associated that we cannot think but in words. . . . Inspiration belongs to every part of Scripture, relates to words as well as thoughts, and is quite compatible with any difference of style exhibited by the sacred writers.' (See the whole article, 'Inspiration.')

This is *practically* the manner in which Christians treat the Bible in argument. Moses Stuart (on the Canon, Dr. Davidson's edition, p. 321) rightly reprehends the unhallowed rashness of Norton: he cites John v. 46, 47 ('he *wrote* of me. But if ye believe not his *writings*, how shall ye believe my words'), and adds, 'It is in vain to make the effort to avoid this. The expedient to which Mr. Norton resorts, in substituting *spoke* for wrote, and *words* for writings, is one which shows the desperate nature of the cause which he is labouring to defend. On this ground no declaration of Scripture, anywhere, in any passage, on any subject, is exempt from arbitrary alteration at the will and pleasure of every reader,' &c. &c. This is *practically* what is meant by *verbal inspiration*, *i. e.* that the writers of Scripture so wrote in every respect as the Holy Ghost *intended*, so that we may use their *words* as authoritative.

to

Digitized by Google

to the genuineness of his work, then the fact of such genuineness is unquestionable: and this criterion he applies to the very Gospel of St. Matthew. In this test we may have full confidence; and we may be equally convinced that what is attested by such a chain of witnesses, as to the *language* of such a document, is just as incontrovertible. How important, then, is it for us to hold fast evidence on the whole subject.[a]

In our day we have seen the speculations of many who would deprive the records of our religion of their historic character; they would thus deprive Christianity of its basis—*facts;* that God sent His only begotten Son into the world; that, as man, He laid down His life for sinners; that He rose from the dead, and that forgiveness is preached in His name. Take away the objective facts, and what is Christianity? The four Gospels, and all that attests them, have been especially attacked. This may show us the importance of not disregarding the evidence on which the New Testament Scriptures have been transmitted to us; but if we reject that evidence in part, do we not at least *weaken* it? On the other hand, we have to hold fast the *authority* of our canonical books: we can do this without at all disregarding the facts which are presented to us; it is only needful for us to see how these things are connected together. If I received the Gospel of Matthew as canonical on insufficient grounds, or taught others so to do, I should feel that I laid it open to attack; but, on the same ground of ancient testimony, I can hold the Hebrew original, and can maintain the canonical authority of the Greek which we possess: the Greek is thus placed upon such a basis that its true authority is in every sense confirmed.

*** Although another view of the subject—that of the twofold original—was taken in a previous Number of this Journal, we

---

[a] I have treated the authority of the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew but briefly. These considerations, however, may now suffice. The whole subject has been taken up more fully in a volume which I have partly prepared, 'Historic Evidence of the Origin and Transmission of the New Testament Scriptures:' illness and pressure of occupation have *retarded* my completing this work.

I do not now enter into an examination of the relation of our Greek Gospel to the Hebrew original. The evidence shows that it was simply a *translation.* Suppositions have been made as to what the translator added. But the additions must first be *proved.* If he made additions, then those additions have come to us with apostolic sanction. But it is needless to regard as additions many of those things which have been specified as such: thus, 'They shall call his name Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us:' why should we regard this last clause as an *addition?* It is not a bare translation, but an authoritative statement that Emmanuel was not a mere name, signifying only *God is with us,* but a divine declaration that the Lord Jesus was really and truly *God with us.* I abide by ancient testimony on this point of the *identity* of the Hebrew and Greek Matthew.

have

Digitized by Google

have much satisfaction in presenting this contribution to the literature of the question, from a pen well qualified to do it full justice. It is our earnest desire to see questions of this class thoroughly and really *discussed* in this publication; for in matters thus controverted, the weight of testimony must be ascertained by comparing the statements of the advocates of *different* views, rather than from the reports of any one writer, who, however inclined to be fair and equal, will inevitably bring out with less force the views he opposes than those which he entertains.

ON THE MOSAIC ACCOUNT OF THE CREATION.

It cannot be denied that there are difficulties in the Mosaic account of the Creation. Some passages in that account appear, on a mere cursory reading, to be at variance with each other, and with the facts of geology. In order to a clear and harmonious understanding of the whole narrative, two or three principles may be (at least hypothetically) assumed.

1. That it did not come within the design of Moses, or rather of the Holy Spirit by whom he was directed, to give a specific account of the creation of the whole universe: the detailed account is confined to what is *historically connected with the origin of our race.* After the general statement given in the first verse, of the creation of the heavens and the earth, the history is wholly confined to the operations of the Deity *upon the earth and its surrounding atmosphere.*

2. That Moses describes the creative process as it would have *appeared* to a spectator stationed on the earth.

3. That the account is given in popular, as contradistinguished from scientific language.

The first and second verses of the 1st chapter of Genesis read thus: '*In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*' 'Now if we attentively consider,' observes Dr. Kerns, 'the first verse, we must regard it as a plain, unconnected, independent statement, constituting an introduction to the history of the commencement of our terrestrial economy, the details of which

Digitized by Google

which begin with the last clause of the 2nd verse—" and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." The beauty and propriety of this introduction must be manifest when we reflect upon the succession of mighty operations which follow. We are first informed that in the *beginning* God created the heavens and the earth. In what state they existed when coming from the Creator's hand, we are not distinctly informed; but it is here distinctly and emphatically declared, that all things were created by God; therefore it must be laid down as a settled proposition that the world is not eternal; which well accords with the geological phenomena daily presented to our observation.'

Bishop Horsley remarks that 'the interval between the production of the matter of the chaos and the formation of light is undefined and unknown.'

For anything in the passage before us, untold ages may have rolled away, and the surface of our globe have been the scene of successive revolutions, prior to the operations of the six days as immediately after recorded. Many a time the sea and land may have exchanged their situations. There may have been several distinct creations of vegetable and animal life; each disappearing in its turn, and being followed, after a longer or shorter interval, by a new order of things; or some few species may have been allowed to survive, amidst the general wreck of their coevals, and to live on contemporary with the various orders belonging to the next subsequent creation. It will be observed that these suppositions are made in view of the facts and deductions of geological science. And it is only necessary for us to suppose that the indefinitely long and bewildering periods essential to the production of the phenomena coming within the range of that science, ran their course between what is said to have occurred in the beginning, (viz., 'the creation,' or calling into existence, 'of the heavens,' including the sun, moon, planets, and fixed stars, 'and the earth;') and the time when it pleased God to place the present races of animals and man upon our globe, to show that science to be in perfect harmony with the Scripture narrative. This exposition, while it allows to geology all it can ask, does no violence to the plain grammatical construction of the language employed by Moses.

In accordance with this we conclude that the phrase 'the evening and the morning' denotes a definite day of twenty-four hours. And with this distinctly in view we shall hastily go over the varied operations of the six days in their successive order, as recorded by the inspired penman.

We read in the 2nd verse that 'the earth was *without form and*

Digitized by Google

and void;' terms expressive of the idea of dreariness and desolation; it was uninhabited and uninhabitable, in a word, chaotic. '*And darkness was upon the face of the deep:*' it may be observed that it is nowhere said that light did not previously exist, or even that it did not exist at this precise period, in the upper regions of the atmosphere; but simply that it 'was *dark* upon the *face*,' or *surface* '*of the deep.*' Perhaps this darkness was occasioned by the obstruction of the rays of the sun by the dense masses of vapour which we may suppose arose from the water that entirely enveloped the globe, or that at least covered that extensive part of the earth's surface which was to be the scene of the present display of creative power.

'*And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*' The solution about to be offered of this passage is advanced with some degree of hesitation. The original term translated *spirit*, signifies also *breath*, or *wind*. It may here be remarked, in passing, that nowhere else in Scripture, so far as the writer is aware, is any part of the creative process attributed to the Holy Spirit. 'All things' are said to have been 'made by the Word;' and 'without him was not anything made that was made.' Let it be supposed that this '*wind*' was made 'to move upon the face of the waters,' and a sufficient cause is assigned for the removal of those masses of vapour which prevented the light from the heavenly bodies falling upon 'the surface of the deep.' Everything being now ready, 'according to his determinate counsel,' 'God said, Let there be light; and there was light.' If this be the true interpretation, it shows that while the effect produced was of the most sublime, beautiful, and beneficial character, the means by which the Almighty chose to accomplish his end were exceedingly simple.

'*And God divided the light from the darkness.*' It has been supposed that this was accomplished by now, for the first time, giving to the earth its rotatory motion upon its axis. The earth's revolution produces a *succession* or *alternation*, and not a *division*, of 'light and darkness.' Possibly the phenomenon here spoken of may have been caused by the light flowing from one source or point, namely the sun, and falling upon the globe of the earth, and thus illuminating one hemisphere while the other remained in darkness. Thus a *division* of light and darkness would necessarily be effected. This exposition perfectly harmonises with, and indeed implies, the previous existence of the sun.

The second day's work is introduced thus: '*And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.*' That is, let there be an expanse, or open space, between the waters that constitute the clouds,

Digitized by Google

clouds, and the waters upon the earth. The previous day's work appears to have prepared the way for the accomplishment of this. The sun's rays now penetrated, unobstructedly, the atmosphere, and by their heat expanded the vapour, rising by evaporation from 'the deep,' thereby occasioning it to be of less specific gravity than the atmosphere, which, pressing down towards the earth, forced the vapour, or rather clouds, upward. Though we are thus ascribing to secondary causes what Moses attributes to the divine Being, it must be confessed that these causes themselves owe their existence to the will of Jehovah. That it should be a property of heat to expand all bodies, and that all bodies should have an attraction towards each other, varying in its degree according to their bulk and density taken together, must, obviously, be referred to the will of some great intelligent Cause.

The production of a firmament, or the bringing into action of those laws by which the clouds float in the broad expanse above, was the work of the *second* day.

The work of the *third* day began by '*the gathering together of the waters under the heaven, and the causing dry land to appear.*' The same subterraneous forces which now not infrequently produce earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, appear to have been brought at this time into extraordinary activity, and to have resulted in the elevation of large tracts of the earth's surface, forming 'dry land,' and in the subsidence of other parts over which our present oceans ebb and flow. The whole process, as indicated by the language of the Psalmist, seems to have presented phenomena of a character imposing and awful beyond conception: 'Thou coveredst the earth with the deep as with a garment: the waters stood above the mountains. At thy rebuke they fled; at the noise of thy thunder they hasted away. They go up by the mountains; they go down by the valleys unto the place which thou hast founded for them. Thou hast set a bound, that they may not pass over; that they turn not again to cover the earth.'—Ps. civ.

'*Let the earth bring forth grass,*' &c. All the living vegetable species appear to have been produced on this day. The three grand divisions are distinctly recognized. The first division is called 'grass,' and probably includes all that is propagated rather from the root than by means of seed. The second is 'herb yielding seed.' This embraces all plants that most obviously propagate themselves by shedding or scattering seed—probably all plants between grasses and trees. The third division comprises trees of every kind—all vegetable formations containing timber.

We

Digitized by Google

We now come to the *fourth* day. This is, apparently, the most difficult portion of the Mosaic narrative. It appears to record the creation of the heavenly bodies—the sun, moon, and stars. And in order to make it harmonize with what is said to have been done '*in the beginning*,' various hypotheses have been proposed. One of the most extensively adopted is the following:—That only a dim glimmering light constituted the three previous days; that supposing some spectator to have stood upon the earth, the heavenly bodies could not have been seen, their light being partially obstructed by dense masses of 'clouds, mist, and vapour,' which are supposed still to have obtained in the atmosphere; that these clouds were carried away on this, the fourth day, and that the sun then shone in all its splendour, as though it had just been created. We regard this as altogether imaginary. It is said in the 4th verse, referring to the *first* day, 'and God saw the light, *that it was good*.' We therefore conclude that on the *first three days* the sun shone forth in all his brightness, and that the moon walked forth in all her beauty;—that these days were as perfect, as regards the light, as was the fourth, or any subsequent day. We must therefore seek a better exposition of what is said respecting the work of the fourth day than is here afforded us.

'We derive considerable assistance,' writes Dr. Kerns, 'in the investigation of this subject, from the remark of Rosenmüller, that the verb *to be* frequently implies a direction or determination of a thing to a certain use: for example, in Zechariah viii. 19, it is said that the several fasts *shall be* to the house of Judah joy, and gladness, and cheerful feasts; and in Numbers x. 31, Moses entreats his father-in-law *to be* to them for a certain purpose. We think this hint (though when known it appears so simple) greatly assists our taking a correct view of the passage before us; for by an easy and unstrained transposition, we may read the 14th verse thus: 'And God said, Let the lights in the firmament of the heaven be, to divide the day from the night.' It also reads in accordance, and we think more forcibly, with the second clause of the verse; for after directing them to a particular use in the dividing of day from night, the same idea is continued in appointing them *to be* for signs, and seasons, and days, and years.' The same principle of interpretation applies, of course, equally to the 16th and two following verses, which contain a recapitulation of what has before been said in reference to the sun and moon. These are thus mentioned again in order to associate them with the stars, to which direct reference is now for the first time made. The latter clause of the 16th verse in the authorized version reads thus: '*He made the stars also*.'

The

Digitized by Google

The words 'he made' are supplied by the translators. The proper rendering seems to be, 'the lesser one with the stars to rule the night.' The whole passage should be rendered thus: 'And God said, Let the lights in the firmament of the heavens be to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years: and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth: and it was so. And God thus made the two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light with the stars to rule the night. And God set them in the firmament of the heavens to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day, and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good.' According to this rendering the work of the fourth day was the appointing or directing of the sun, moon, and stars (all of which were previously in existence) to particular, specified, and important purposes.

In confirmation of this view we may refer to the 104th Psalm, which furnishes a beautiful and striking comment upon the first four days of the creation. The word '*thyself*' in the 2nd verse of the English version, is of no authority. The ellipsis ought probably to have been supplied by the words '*the earth.*' That verse would then have read: 'Who coverest the earth with light as with a garment.' This is a relation of the first day's work. 'Who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain.' Here is the creation of a *firmament*, the work of the second day. The 6th verse reads: 'Thou coveredst the earth with the deep as with a garment: the waters stood above the mountains. At thy rebuke they fled.' The 14th verse, 'Thou causest the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man: Thou bringest forth food out of the earth.' This is a full description of the work of the third day. The Psalmist now goes on to say (19th verse), not that God 'created two great lights,' and that 'he made the stars also,' but, 'Thou appointest the moon for seasons. The sun knoweth his going down.' Here is the ordaining of the heavenly bodies to particular ends.

But if the purpose of the fourth day's work was to place the heavenly bodies in certain relationships to our planet, the question now arises, What physical means were adopted to accomplish that purpose? Is it not possible that the whole was effected by now giving to the axis of the earth its present inclination? This exposition perfectly agrees with the principles assumed and laid down for our guidance; that after the general statement given in the first verse, the history is wholly confined to the operations of the Deity upon the earth and its attendant atmosphere; and that Moses described things according to their appearance. The phenomena

Digitized by Google

phenomena spoken of by Moses, namely, 'season, days, and years,' as first originated on the fourth day, and as they still continue, are all occasioned by the inclination of the earth's axis. Had this still continued, as we apprehend it was until the day under review, perfectly parallel to the axis of the sun, our days would have been of one unvarying length, and have flowed on in one unbroken and monotonous succession; there would have been no interchange of summer and winter, spring and autumn.[a] Moses described certain appearances,—certain *effects;* and left to science the discovering of the physical *causes* by which they were produced. It has been said that he was not qualified to write a history of the creation: for if he had been, it is argued, he would have given a philosophical description of it. An unreasonable demand, truly! Suppose, for one moment, that the narrative ran thus: 'And God said to the axis of the earth, Be thou inclined: and the earth's axis was inclined.' The whole world would have wondered for three thousand years what could possibly be meant by the mysterious words 'the earth's axis,' and what its inclination could have to do with the happiness or the natural or moral history of man. But the account supplied by the sacred historian, though given in popular language, is strictly true. Almost every advance in science confirms its truth. The sacred narrative has nothing to fear from true science; the two things must harmonize, from the truthfulness and immutable character of Him who is the author both of the Bible and the facts and laws which science discovers and arranges; and nothing but the mists of our own ignorance intercept a clear vision of striking and frequently recurring evidences rendered by each of the truth of the other.

We must now glance for a moment at the operations of the *fifth* day. To whatever secondary causes we may have attributed the productions of the previous days, we may be sure that no physical cause, nor any concurrence—much less any fortuitous concurrence of physical causes—however numerous or complicated, could supply the functions of animal life, or originate the powers of thought and feeling. We must, therefore, refer all that remains in connection with the creation to the *direct* energy of an infinite and intelligent Cause, viz. God.

---

[a] That some such change as this has, at some period or other, taken place, the facts of geology seem to indicate. Certain 'remains' have been found in regions where, according to the temperature that now obtains, the living individuals could never have existed. Nor can this fact be referred to the deluge of Noah; for then all would have been thrown indiscriminately together. But instead of this we find that different species are confined to different strata; proving, first, that they did not live, and were not embedded, at the same period; and, secondly, that the animals lived and died on the spot.

On

Digitized by Google

On this day it should seem that the Almighty created *all things that have life*, whose peculiar element is either *water* or *air*. It should be observed here that our authorized version implies that the *water* brought forth the *fowl*, as well as the aquatic animals: whereas, it is said in the 19th verse of the second chapter, 'and *out of the ground* the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every *bird* of the air.' It has been suggested that the latter clause of the 20th verse of the first chapter should read, '*And let birds fly above the earth, in the open firmament of heaven*;' leaving it undetermined as to the substance from which they were formed.

Again, Professor Bush observes that neither the word 'birds' nor the word 'fowl' fully expresses the original. The phrase used by Moses implies '*every thing that has wings*,'—including all the various tribes that can raise themselves up into the air. The work of the *fifth* day, then, appears to have been the causing of the waters to bring forth *every living thing*, of whatever kind, that *inhabits that element*; and the forming from the earth all kinds of birds, bats, and insects,—in a word, all things capable of sustaining themselves in the air—of flying 'in the open firmament of heaven.'

'*And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creatures after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.*' The term translated 'living creature' is a collective singular, and probably includes within itself the three kinds of animals which are immediately afterwards specified. 'Cattle:' this comprises all *herbivorous* animals, especially such as are good for human food. 'Creeping things:' all kinds of reptiles. '*And beasts* of the earth:' wild beasts, as contradistinguished from tame animals,—more particularly those that were carnivorous. The remaining and crowning work of the *sixth* day was the creation of '*man*.'

In devoutly contemplating the successive scenes and mighty operations connected with the 'six days of creation,' how naturally is the mind filled with feelings of profound awe, veneration, wonder, and love! But if our minds be rightly attuned, there will be another class of feelings, among which humility and gratitude will occupy a conspicuous place, when in our meditation we associate, or rather *identify*, the almighty Creator with our merciful and gracious Redeemer. 'By *Him* were all things created, whether they be things in heaven or things on the earth!' And may we not conclude that the work of creation is still going on—that new worlds are being called into existence, and that those already created are being periodically replenished with organized existences? And if so, may we not

Digitized by Google

venture humbly to hope that we, insignificant and unworthy as it must be confessed we are, in a future stage of our being may have the high honour and the inexpressible felicity of being among 'the morning stars' that shall 'sing together,' and the 'sons of God' that shall 'shout for joy,' at the creating or adorning of some world of light and beauty in the distant fields of our almighty Father's illimitable dominions? How emphatic the language of our Redeemer: 'Father, I desire that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; *that they may behold my glory!*'

ON HEBREW TENSES.

Sir,—Will you permit me to lay before your readers a view of the Hebrew tenses, partly confirming and partly introducing a necessary and important modification of that which is put forward in an able article of your last Number. I shall first make a brief categorical statement of my view, and afterwards dwell on such parts of it as seem to run counter to ordinary notions.

Tense is the time form of the verb. It may denote merely that the event is before, at, or after whatever point of time is in view; as is the case in the Hebrew language. Or it may denote that the event is past, present, or future; as is the case with the only time-forms we have in the English language. Or it may denote both of these relations of time together; as is the case in the Greek and Latin languages. This double reference gives rise to nine possible expressions of time, exemplified and arranged in the following

Time-phrase Table.

I had done	I did	I went to do
I have done	I do	I go to do
I shall have done	I shall do	I shall go to do

Here every tense expresses two relations; the relation of the scene of action to the time of the narrator, as past, present, or to come: and the relation of the action to a contemplated point in its own scene, as before, at, or after that point. To avoid the confusion of the old nomenclature, the following scheme of tense names has been devised.

Tense

Digitized by Google

TENSE NAMES.

Antepreterite (præt. perf.)	Preterite (præt. imperf.)	Postpreterite (aorist)
Antepresent (præs. perf.)	Present (præs. imperf.)	Postpresent
Antefuture (fut. perf.)	Future (fut. imperf.)	Postfuture

Each of these names denotes both the relations above mentioned; and those agreeing in one relation may be grouped together by a common name, either horizontally, as preterites, presents, or futures; or vertically, as the anterior, central, or posterior tenses. The anterior tenses express events which are ended at the point of time contemplated, whether past, present, or future. The posterior tenses express events which are to commence at the time contemplated. The centre tenses express events of which not the end or the beginning, but the centre or some internal point is at the time contemplated. The extreme tenses then agree in having one extremity to a certain degree determined. The central tenses are distinguished from both in having, not the end or beginning, but an internal point determined.

To illustrate the formative tendencies of the languages already named, we submit the following

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF TENSES.

egeram εἱστήκειν	agebam ἵστην I did	ἔστησα,
egi ἕστηκα פָּעַל	ago ἵστημι I do	στήσω יִפְעַל
egero ἑστήξω	agam	

This table exhibits, it will be observed, what we have intimated to be the germinating principle of the Hebrew tense system. The Hebrew verb has only two regularly inflected tenses. These are the anterior, expressing an action ended, and the posterior, expressing an action to begin at the point of time contemplated by the speaker. There is no inflected form for the central tense. The active participles, however, express an action current, and accordingly serve for the

Digitized by Google

central tense. The Hebrew tenses thus express only one of the relations of time, namely, the state of the action at a certain point of time, whether ended, current, or to begin. Whether this point is past, present, or future is left to be regulated by other circumstances expressed or understood apart from the time forms. The posterior tense may be said to be the direct form of the verb, as it describes an action as regarded from its commencement; the anterior, as the inverse form, as it describes the action as viewed from its close.

Having thus explicitly and comparatively stated our theory, we proceed to defend it; first, positively, by showing its use and applicability, and then, negatively, by pointing out the inadequacy of other theories.

I. In the first place, then, we are to show its use and applicability. Its *use* is founded upon the attitude the Hebrew thinker naturally assumes in contemplating events. Coming from his own time, he takes his stand at a point of time within, or at least not beyond, the initial event, and thence takes cognizance of the several events of the series, as they move along at their natural pace. The initial event, being usually beyond him, he describes by the proper extreme tense. Any event, similarly situated, he conceives also beyond him in the same field of view with the former, and expresses by the same tense. If the first event be at the point of observation, or if any event, being equally related to what precedes and what follows, be therefore conceived at the point of observation, he expresses it by the central tense. Any event correlative to the anterior part of the series, and forming or going to form the counterpart of the series, viewed as a symmetrical whole, he conceives to be on the other side of the point of time from which his observation is taken, and accordingly describes by the opposite extreme tense. Succession, or temporal contact of events, is not expressed by the time form, but merely implied by the conjunction being prefixed to the second verb. But if the conjunction be prefixed to any other word in the sentence, it intimates a special connection of the events with or without succession, though the progress of time is still uninterrupted. An event may be said to be detached or attached according as it is expressed by a verb, without or with a prefixed conjunction.

From these premises we deduce the following formula for the usual direct narrative of a train of events; *a detached event is beyond, an attached event within, the point of observation.* Which branches out into the following practical rules:—1, a detached past event is expressed by the anterior tense; 2, a detached future, by the posterior; 3, an attached past, by the posterior; 4, an attached future, by the anterior. The occasional deviations from these rules arise from their being crossed by other principles, and are provided for by the preceding observations.

By entering into a familiar exemplification of these principles and rules, we shall establish their *applicability*. both to historical and prophetical narrative. Let us conceive the Hebrew writer, then, proceeding to his task of composition. With his simple apparatus of tenses,

Digitized by Google

tenses, he approaches the scene of events he wishes to describe. He imagines the series in pictorial review; but the picture, we are to remember, is chronological rather than geographical. For his own point of observation either descends nearly in the chronological line, or is nearly stationary, while this line with its whole scene of changes ascends in the contrary direction. He takes his stand, then, next the initial event, on his own side of it, not beyond it. For, in the first place, he has a tacit consciousness of his own time, and thence his imagination has carried him towards the event. When he first meets it, therefore, he finds himself on his own side of it, and to go farther, in order to take cognizance of it and give expression to it, is unnecessary, if not unnatural. And, in the second place, beyond the first event is a region beyond observation, and therefore unknown and undefined; whereas to suppose him there implies that it has known and definite points. In fact, the Hebrew thinker does not conceive a beginning made, without some distinct event, constituting that initial change, and definitely marking off and closing the unrecognized duration beyond. The opening event, then, *in history*, is before him in point of time, and is therefore expressed by the anterior tense: Gen. i. 1. בָּרְאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ׃ *In the beginning God has created the heavens and the earth.* If the next event have the same bearing with the former, it is expressed by the same tense, while the conjunction is prefixed to the emphatic word, which marks the relation between the two events. Gen. i. 2: וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה, *And the earth has been.* These are both detached past events and expressed by the anterior tense. The latter form of sentence, however, seldom occurs, and is to be regarded as expressive rather of an appendage to the former than of a distinct transaction. In a very rare instance of this kind the conjunction is prefixed to the verb itself, exhibiting a deviation, not from the principles, but from the rules laid down. Job i. 1: וְהָיָה, *and that man has been.* If an event occur at the point of observation it is of course expressed by the central tense. Gen. i. 2 perhaps furnishes an instance of this kind, וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת׃ *and the Spirit of God moving.* This constitutes the centre of the series. An event after this belongs to the counterpart of the series, and is conceived to be after the point of view, and therefore described by the posterior tense with the conjunction prefixed. This is an attached past event and expressed accordingly. Gen. i. 3: וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים, *And God goes on to say.* This is a specimen of that antithesis or symmetrical contrast which is familiar to the Hebrew thinker. In some instances of it the extremes are the points of view; in others, as in this, the centre is fixed upon, from which there is a retrospective view, *he has done*, and then a prospective, *he goes on to do.* We shall meet with other instances of the same habit of mind. The events then following in succession are expressed exactly in the same manner, whether it is that the whole group of successive events is contrasted with the one simple or complex primal event, or each with its immediate antecedent tacitly conceived in the aspect

Digitized by Google

aspect opposite to that in which it was expressed. I incline to the latter view, though it is more involved, because I conceive the mind begins at least with simple cases and proceeds in its conceptions rather with astonishing rapidity than with lengthened forethought. An event that is parallel with another, or complementary of it, appears before our point of time, when we are at the close of its parallel or complement, and is therefore expressed by prefixing the conjunction to another word and reversing the tense of the verb. Gen. i. 5: וְלַחֹשֶׁךְ קָרָא לָיְלָה. And God goes on to call to the light day, *and to the darkness he has called night.* This is a detached part and the tense is anterior. Here is another antithesis to express a completed process from its two extremities. At the commencement of the event the mind is before it in point of time, but when it has stated part of it it finds itself at the end, and therefore after it, and so has to use the retrospective tense to describe so much of it as has not yet been stated. Parallel events are expressed in the same antithesis, because the progress of time places the point of view, which was before the former, after the latter. Gen. ii. 21: וּלְאָדָם לֹא־מָצָא, *and to Adam he has not found.* If the latter event, however, do not close up and complete the former, but rather outruns the usual duration of an event, then it is expressed by the posterior tense, even when there is some parallelism, and the conjunction is disconnected from the verb. Gen. ii. 25: וְלֹא יִתְבּוֹשָׁשׁוּ, *and they go on to be not ashamed.* This is a rare deviation from our rule.

The description of present events is given on the same principles, and requires only a word. The first event may be at the present moment, and is expressed by the active participle. Another event may be contemporary with this, to express which, as above explained, the spectator, now at the close of the former event, severs the verb from the conjunction and puts in the anterior tense. When, however, he comes to a successive event he prefixes the conjunction to the posterior tense. Zech. vi. 6, 7: *Wherein the black horses are going forth* (יֹצְאִים), *and the white have gone forth* (יָצְאוּ), *and the grisled have gone forth, And the bay have gone forth, and go on to seek* (וַיְבַקְּשׁוּ).

In prophecy the Hebrew thinker, in like manner, conceives himself on his own side of, or not beyond, the starting event. This event is accordingly regarded sometimes as at the moment of observation, and, therefore, expressed by the interjection and the active participle. Isa. iii. 1: הִנֵּה הָאָדוֹן יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת מֵסִיר, *behold the Lord Jehovah of hosts removing.* Generally, however, the event is after the point of observation chosen, and therefore expressed by the posterior tense. Josh. vi. 26: בִּבְכֹרוֹ יְיַסְּדֶנָּה, *in his firstborn he goes to lay the foundation of it.* Here is a detached future and the tense posterior. Let us contrast with this the historical account of its fulfilment. The historian finds himself standing also within the event when past, and so on the other side of it, and writes, 1 Kings xvi. 34, בַּאֲבִירָם בְּכֹרוֹ יִסָּדָהּ, *in Abiram his firstborn he has laid the foundation of it.* The event thus thrown

as

Digitized by Google

as a definite boundary into the region out of the mind's view, in the first case into the unregarded future, in the second into the unseen past, is manifestly treated as a point or indivisible unit serving as the given extremity both of the indefinite line of time beyond, and of the definite line within the range of vision. If a second event have the same relation with the first to the whole series, the verb is detached from the conjunction and put into the same time-form. Josh. vi. 26: וּבִצְעִירוֹ יַצִּיב, *and in his youngest he goes to set up.* This is according to rule. Having observed and described the initial event, whether simple or complex, the spectator in imagination glances along the line of action to a close, and standing there contemplates the reverse event of the series as before the point of view, and therefore describes it by the anterior tense with the conjunction prefixed, thus exemplifying our rule. Josh. vi. 26, אֲשֶׁר יָקוּם וּבָנָה, *who goes to arise and has built.* Here we have an antithesis regarded from its extremities. Then follow a number of completions, all forming the antithesis of the primal event, or each antithetical to its antecedent which is expressed in the inverted form, and then understood in the direct form: Isa. ii. 3, 4. But if any event be viewed out of connection with the preceding, because it is parallel to it in point of time, or contrasted with it, or for any other reason, then the verb is disannexed from the conjunction and put in the posterior tense as a new initiative. Isa. ii. 4: לֹא־יִשָּׂא, *nation goes not to lift up* sword against nation. Even here there is an antithesis between the last completive and this initiative.

This closes our rapid sketch of the most striking feature of historic and prophetic narrative, the description of a complete cycle of events. It will be seen that every part of the historic is in strict contrast with the corresponding part of the prophetic account, and thus that the two form a grand antithesis in themselves. We conceive that this circumstance alone forms a complete demonstration of our view of the tense system. The historian views events as causes, the prophet as effects. The former regards the actual progress and order of their occurrence, and, therefore, when he has marked off antecedent time by an anterior tense, he notices the beginnings of events as coming first, unless some sufficient and obvious reason leads him to view an occasional event in the opposite aspect. The latter regards the actual progress and order of their specification according to the plan he has laid down of the future scene, and, consequently, when he has defined the commencement by an initial tense, he conceives himself at the opposite extreme, contemplating the successive ends he proposes to be accomplished in the entire procedure. The one is always at some point within the whole group of events described, and as an intelligent and attentive observer notices them as they successively come into existence; the other is always without the cumulative series of events designed, pondering them with thoughtful premeditation as he maps out their successive accomplishment. The historian is the student of nature, he marks causes; the prophet is the author of nature, he notes down ends.

We have confined ourselves to the connected group of events, because, if our theory meet this case, it will solve all those of minor difficulty.

Digitized by Google

difficulty. We have not entered into the details of the imperative mood, or of the means of expressing the other moods of classical languages, because our simple object has been to establish the meaning of the two Hebrew tenses. And we merely mention farther that the prophet often, by a natural flight of enthusiastic fancy, imagines himself in the position of the historian, and then of course adopts the historic usage of the tenses. It may be said on review that our system displays some minute disquisition, and that our rule admits of exceptions which virtually invalidate it. We admit there is some disquisition, nay, we believe that a still greater amount of painstaking distinction will be requisite to explain all contingencies. But the objections here urged lie equally, if not in a tenfold greater degree, against every system we have heard propounded. Let it be observed, however, that the fundamental principle of our tense system is constant and undeviating. It is only against the formula for its application that the seeming objection lies. Now the usage of tenses must depend upon the using mind and the capabilities of these tenses. Accordingly where we have discovered a habitude of mind, as in the narrative of a series of events, we have laid down an absolute rule of uniform application as long as the mind is not diverted from the ordinary course by any break or change in the concatenation of events. But the mind is free—free as the winds from all stern control or computation, in the view it takes of incidental movements in the scene. And, therefore, while we have done our best to conceive and assign the motives for the mind's attitude toward the event in the instances we have adduced, we may not have been successful in every case, and we do not pretend to lay down a rigid rule for the usage of speech in every one of the possible relations in which events may be placed. We think it enough to have laid down principles which, we conceive, will account for every case, and to add that in practice when one encounters another, that which on such an occasion has most influence with the mind of the individual, or of the race, will take effect to the exclusion of the other.

With regard to the phraseology we have employed to indicate our sense of the tenses in translation, we are far from meaning that it should be adopted in a version of the Scriptures. But we believe that this or something similar should be used by beginners in order to learn the true genius of the language they are studying. The phrases, I have a work done, I have a work a-doing, I have a work to do, have the advantage of exhibiting the common reference to one point of time in the constant part and the respective distinctions of before, at, and after, in the variable part. But, apart from the improper meaning which the last suggests, the standing defect is, that in languages like our own, which have distinctive forms for past, present, and future, the constant in the above expressions suggests the present time, whereas the point of time in Hebrew is variable, according to the exigency of the narrative. This introduces an awkwardness and an apparent inconsistency into any literal rendering of a Hebrew record, but it is to be remembered that it affects the rendering only, not the original.

Digitized by Google

original. With these explanations we believe that, according to our theory of it, the Hebrew tense system is free from that intricacy which has been supposed inherent in it, and, as an instrument of narrative, may challenge comparison in point of precision with those of the more affluent Indo-germanic family. It makes a more regular and efficient use than any of them of the posterior tense. The language to which it belongs is pre-eminently that of the narrative and the objective.

II. Having now given a rule for the usage and a specimen of the applicability of our system, we proceed to point out the untenableness of other theories. In the first place then, the two Hebrew tenses cannot mean any two of the three called by us past, present, and future, nor can either of them signify any one of these tenses; for both are used in the record either of a past or of a future series of events according to an established law. From this simple fact it follows, first, that neither of them can be a proper past or future, for in that case one event of a series wholly past or wholly future would be at a distance from our present on one side, and other events of the same series far dissevered from it on the other side, whereas they are all on one side. It follows next that they cannot be both proper presents, for then they would be interchangeable, whereas they are used with strict discrimination in the narrative of a series. This overturns all theories in which any of these tense names is applied to either of them, and therefore that of Gesenius, in which one of them is called a future, that of Lee, in which the same one is called a present, and, in terms at least, that of Mr. Weir, in which they are called present and future. Having dismissed then the one relation of time, we have remaining the other, namely, the position of the event before, at, or after a point of time determined by certain habitudes of the conversing minds. Employing then, meanwhile, our own names for the tenses expressing these positions, we have to determine which two of the three are meant by the two Hebrew time-forms. That these are the anterior and posterior we prove by various arguments. First, the structure of these tenses. In the former the order of the elements is, verbal stem, pronominal formative; in the latter, the reverse. The pronoun we conceive represents the point of time, so often referred to, at which the mind is; the verbal stem represents the event as in the one case before, and in the other after this point. Secondly, the strict antithesis in the use of these two tenses. The one initiates a series of past events, the other a series of future events. The one continues the latter series, the other the former. In these circumstances there is no reason for one being central more than the other, and hence no reason for either, and therefore all the reason for each being extreme. And lastly, the existence of other means of denoting centrality, namely, the active participle and any other predicate joined to a subject with no copula expressed. Hence all theories are unfounded that make one of these tenses the central, and therefore that of Ewald, adopted by Rödiger, which makes them the perfect and imperfect, that is, as we shall see, the anterior and the central, and that of Mr. Weir, which makes them the present and future, that is, the central and the posterior.

These

Digitized by Google

These authors agree in holding that the relation of time expressed by the Hebrew tenses is that of the event to a point of time in its immediate neighbourhood. While we conceive them right on this point, we believe them wrong in conceiving that one of these must be the central, and this error has led the former to make one, the latter the other of the two, central, while there is not the shadow of a reason in favour of one more than the other. We have already stated our reasons for regarding them as the anterior and posterior, and submit that these opposite theories go far to neutralise one another, and to corroborate the second of our arguments.

We conclude by stating our objections to the terminology of these writers. Present and future, when employed to signify at, and after, a point which may itself be past, present, or to come, are used in a sense so different from their ordinary popular meaning, that they tend to perpetuate all the old confusion in which the subject has been involved. As this new meaning of them, therefore, is improper, as it has not even been accurately defined, and as, even if it had, it would come into constant collision with the proper meaning, we contend that it ought to be discarded. The time-honoured terms, perfect and imperfect, though correctly used by Ewald and others, ought to be rejected, not because they apply only to active verbs (for we rejoice in the good old English phrase, the house is a-building, though not in the modern barbarism, the house is being built, as the translation of the Latin ædificatur, which we believe is a passive imperfect), but because they express not the essential difference, but an accident of the thing denominated. This is a tense; the essence of a tense is a relation of time; the relation is conveyed in the words before, at, or after a certain point of time. Perfect or imperfect may be applied to an action done before, at, or after any point of time. Besides one of them is negative, and one important tense especially in the Hebrew language is left without a name, and has therefore been overlooked or misplaced. For all these reasons we prefer the terms anterior, central, and posterior.

Belfast. JAMES G. MURPHY.

Digitized by Google

MISCELLANEA.

REMARKS ON HEB. XIII. 7-16.

THE Epistle to the Hebrews is one of those portions of Scripture for the elucidation of which much yet remains to be done. Those who have hitherto applied their talents and learning to the work of expounding its contents, have, as it appears to us, often been wanting in a due appreciation of the peculiar circumstances under which it was written; they have not always borne in mind the feelings, opinions, and prejudices prevalent in the minds of the Hebrew converts addressed, nor sufficiently remembered that the writer was himself one of the same race, educated under the same system, and once proud of the same privileges as a son of Abraham. Living themselves in the full sunlight of Christian truth and Christian privilege, such expositors have failed to throw themselves back, as it were, into that twilight hour when Judaism and Christianity existed side by side, and when the waning glories of the former were about to give place to the increasing radiance of the latter. There has been wanting, at the same time, a correct and judicious estimate of that darker period when Jehovah was by revelations, gradually increasing in depth and distinctness, training up his chosen people for the coming of the Messiah (Gal. iii. 24), and when the truths of the everlasting Gospel were as yet wrapt in the folds of type and prophecy. As an illustration of the want expressed above, we venture to submit to the judgment of our readers an interpretation of the passage contained between the seventh and sixteenth verses of chap. xiii., and would also fain indulge a hope that, should it find favour with any of them, it may help to throw light upon other parts of this most important and instructive epistle: these may as yet have been but imperfectly understood from a pernicious habit, into which all students of Scripture are too liable to fall, of finding in it more than its writers meant to convey, instead of endeavouring, in imagination, to make themselves one in thought and feeling with that mixed society of Jews and Gentiles which constituted the Church of the first century.

Before, however, we proceed to examine the passage itself, it will be necessary to make a few preliminary observations bearing

Digitized by Google

bearing upon the general character of the Epistle considered as a whole.

I. According to the testimony of Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Theodoret, and other ancient writers, St. Paul wrote to the Hebrews in the Hebrew language: now to us there appears no sufficient reason for rejecting evidence so clear and positive, tending as it does to remove many of the difficulties suggested by a careful study of the Epistle; but we would at present only contend that the intimate acquaintance with Jewish history and Jewish practices manifested by its author, as well as the language he employs (see especially xiii. 13-15), would lead to the conclusion that whoever the writer was, and in whatever language he wrote, he was himself a converted Jew writing to his brethren in the flesh, in order to warn them of that apostasy to which they were so strongly tempted, and encourage them to 'hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering.'

II. It appears evident, not only from the frequent quotations of so early a writer as Clement of Rome, but also from internal evidence, that the Epistle was written before the destruction of the temple, and not long before that event. In proof of this we would only refer to the following passages, calling attention particularly to the tenses employed in the original:—v. 1-4; viii. 3-5; ix. 6-10, 22; x. 1-3, 11, 28; see also x. 23-25.

III. The main drift of the Apostle's argument is to prove the vast superiority of the new over the old dispensation, and to show that the latter was intended by God to be one of a temporary character, and to prepare a way for the former: he, therefore, points out that the law was only 'a shadow of good things to come' (x. 1), and that all its characteristic rites and ceremonies were in themselves fleshly, and totally incompetent to 'take away sin' (x. 4) or 'purge the conscience from dead works' (ix. 14); though when viewed by the reflected light of the Gospel, they are seen to be full of meaning and instruction to the enlightened believer in Christ. He thence infers the danger of 'neglecting so great salvation,' and warns his brethren of the sin of 'treading under foot the Son of God,' and 'doing despite unto the spirit of grace' (x. 29).

IV. We know from the testimony of Scripture and the earliest Christian writers, that, in the infancy of Christianity, its chief enemies were the unbelieving Jews from without, and the Judaizing Christians within: against the latter, more especially, St. Paul seems to have waged unceasing warfare: we would do no more than refer to such a passage as Gal. v. 1-15, as manifesting the warmth of his feelings on this subject. The intimations of Scripture, however, and of Apostolic writers, are so faint and scattered,

Digitized by Google

tered, that we are enabled to form but a very imperfect idea of the controversy; and hence arises the difficulty of fully understanding many passages in which there are evident allusions to doctrines and opinions common in that age, but with which we have scarcely any means of becoming acquainted through other and more direct channels of information. For example, we are able to gather the general fact that many of the believing Jews still maintained the efficacy of certain kinds of food (1 Cor. viii. 8), and wished to keep up the distinction of the law between clean and unclean meats (See Col. ii. 16-23; Rom. xiv. 13-17; 1 Tim. iv. 3); yet we are very imperfectly acquainted with the details of their system, and therefore can little judge how far it really affected the faith and practice of its advocates.

Keeping these considerations in view, we now turn to the passage before us, which has been variously interpreted by commentators, ancient and modern. And, first, as to the limits of the paragraph, it has been usual to divide the section contained between verses 7 and 16 into two portions; the first ending with the 10th, and the second with the 15th verse. But even at first sight there appears to be so obvious a connection between the 10th and 11th verses, united as they are by the connective particle γάρ, that we should hesitate to make a break at this point: Stuart, who has retained the customary divisions, feeling the difficulty, has given to γάρ in verse 11 the sense of 'moreover,' a signification which it seldom if ever bears in the Greek Testament.

Again, there is sufficient connection, as will be seen hereafter, between verses 15 and 16 to warrant our closing the paragraph at the end of the 16th instead of the 15th verse.

Let us next endeavour to trace the thread of the Apostle's argument through the section thus defined. He begins by admonishing the Hebrew believers to keep alive in their breasts the memory of those guides who had first taught them the truths of the Gospel, and to consider the issue of their conduct in life, that they might thereby be encouraged to tread in their footsteps and cleave steadfastly to their faith. That faith had reposed simply on 'Christ and him crucified,' on 'Christ and the power of his resurrection:' *He* was the source and spring of all their spiritual life and support; *His* cross had been the rallying-point of all their hopes and consolations. And was it different now? No! 'Jesus Christ is the same to-day as yesterday, and he will be the same for ever.' The opinions of men may and do fluctuate with the changes of times and circumstances; but Christ crucified and yet triumphant over sin and death—Christ the one Mediator between God and man, 'ever liveth to make intercession' for his people, and hence he is to them in all ages and amid all variations the

Digitized by Google

the only 'sure and steadfast anchor of their souls.' The Apostle therefore proceeds (ver. 9) to warn his brethren against allowing themselves to be carried away [a] (παραφέρεσθε) by various doctrines foreign to the simplicity of that faith in which they had been instructed; and with a special allusion to certain Judaizing teachers who insisted on distinctions of meats and drinks—he argues that the heart derives strength and sustenance from the love and favour of God in Christ, rather than from different kinds of food; these could not satisfy the inward cravings of a man's heart, and were of no service even to those who lived under a system based upon their observance (ix. 9, 10). He next confirms and illustrates his position, as he does in many other parts of the epistle, from *existing* institutions, reasoning with the converts *as Jews:* he shows them that, even in the Mosaic system, the utter futility of meats and drinks, and all such external ordinances, so far as the conscience is concerned, was prefigured by the provisions of the law itself with regard to *sin-offerings*, 'whereof the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal,' and more especially those peculiar to the great day of atonement, in which the sacrifice of 'the Lamb of God' was most strikingly and powerfully shadowed forth. 'We Jews,' he says, 'have an altar off which those who serve the tabernacle are not authorized to *eat* any portion of the victim, *for* the *bodies* of those animals whose *blood* is carried as *an atonement for sin* into the Holy place by the High Priest are always entirely burnt and consumed outside the camp.' (See Lev. iv. 1-21; *vi.* 30; xvi. 15-28). Thus the law itself might teach them that the *blood* is the all-important part of an expiatory victim, and so prepare them for the reception of the great truth prefigured thereby—that 'the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin.' The thoughts of the writer are now fixed upon Christ as the victim; and, to use Paley's expression, he 'goes off' at the words 'outside the camp,' and takes occasion thence to point out another remarkable coincidence between this victim and those of the law: 'therefore,' he continues—that is to say, in order to show that He was the great sin-offering—'Jesus also suffered outside the gate of the city, in order that he might sanctify his people through his own blood.' And why was the victim thus carried out of the sacred enclosure of the camp, and there entirely consumed? Because it was considered to bear the sins of the whole people, and therefore too accursed and polluted to be suffered to remain within the precincts of the tabernacle. Jesus, too, in like manner, consented to be 'made a curse for us,' and to die

[a] Or—if the reading περιφέρεσθε be preferred—'to be tossed about.'

the

Digitized by Google

the ignominious death of a criminal outside the city walls. 'Therefore,' he proceeds, 'let us who have been made members of his body, come forth and join Him outside the camp and be content to bear his reproach:' that is, 'to be, like Him, regarded by our fellow citizens as outcasts and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and, if need be, to suffer as martyrs for his name's sake; seeing that our polity must soon come to an end, and therefore *here* we have no permanent city to look to as our dwelling-place; all our hopes and desires must henceforth be fixed on the eternal city destined for our abode, the heavenly Jerusalem. Let us, then, no longer cling to the sin-offerings and burnt-offerings of our perishing temple, but since Christ, "the end of the law," is come, let us rather, through Him, as our great and only High-priest, offer up a perpetual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; and instead of the fruits of the earth, let us consecrate to Him the fruit of lips, uniting in the confession of His name; not forgetting to do good and to communicate with one another, for it is such spiritual sacrifices as these that are acceptable in the sight of God.'

Such is the interpretation which commends itself to us as most in accordance with the scope and tenor of the rest of the epistle, and most suitable to the position both of the writer and the persons whom he addresses. It now only remains to add a few remarks explanatory of the exposition given above.

It is clear that the key-word, if we may so speak, of the whole section is θυσιαστήριον in ver. 10. Various are the senses attached to this term by commentators; some are of opinion that Christ is the altar; others that the Church is meant; and others, again, see in the word a manifest allusion to the so-called sacrifice of the mass. As a sample of the view generally taken by expositors from the earliest times, we subjoin the following extract from the commentary of Professor Stuart. 'Ver. 10, ἔχομεν . . . λατρεύοντες, "we have an altar" . . . A figurative expression borrowed from the Jewish ritual, and accommodated to express the privileges of Christians. . . . The reference in our text is to those sacrifices, a part of which were eaten by the priests and the officers, in so far as the writer alludes to partaking of them; but when he says that Christians have a sacrifice of which those who pay their service to the altar have no right to partake, he means that the benefits procured by the atoning sacrifice of Christ do not belong or will not be granted to such as rest their hopes of salvation on the ritual sacrifices of the Jewish law, *i. e.* to such as continue to be disciples of Judaism, or turn back from Christianity to Judaism, and thus renounce the blessings procured for believers by the death of Christ.' Here it will be observed that Prof. Stuart sees in ἔχομεν θυσιαστήριον . . . 'a

figurative

Digitized by Google

figurative expression, borrowed from the Jewish ritual, and *accommodated to express the privileges of Christians.*' Now, we can see no necessity for departing in this place from the plain and literal acceptation of the words: the oft-quoted canon of Hooker respecting the preference due to as literal an interpretation of Scripture as possible is surely nowhere more applicable than in the didactic and argumentative portions of the epistles. In the language of poetry and prophecy we are prepared for a style interwoven with figure and metaphor, but in the sober statements of an historian and the plain instructions of a teacher, whose object is not to disguise but to reveal the truth, we ought to be slow in admitting a figurative interpretation, unless the context seems clearly to demand it.

It has also been usual to suppose that the Apostle intended in ver. 10 to draw a contrast between consistent Christians and such as still trusted in some measure to the Mosaic rites, the former being denoted by the pronoun 'we,' and the latter by 'those who serve the tabernacle;' but, in the first place, it can hardly be imagined that he meant to affirm that those Christian Jews who were still addicted to Judaism had no *right* to partake of the Christian atonement, nor did the Apostle when he became a Christian, cease, on that account, to consider himself a Jew, or at times to act as such; for he asks at the beginning of the 11th chapter of his epistle to the Romans: 'Hath God cast away his people? God forbid: for *I also am an Israelite* of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin,' see also Acts xvi. 3; xxi. 20-26.

Again, we would understand the phrase οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες, as referring to the priests in particular (Comp. viii. 5; Lev. vi. 25-30), rather than to Judaizers in general; for the verb λατρεύειν, as used in Scripture, is applied generally to the performance of external acts of worship.

Lastly, the commonly received interpretation would require the presence of ἡμεῖς before ἔχομεν, for, as is well known, the pronouns (which are generally wanting in Greek and Latin, their place being supplied by the termination of the verb) are always inserted when a particular *emphasis* is intended to be laid upon them; as would be the case in the present instance, if the writer meant to say 'we Christians, in opposition to others.'

One other point remains to be explained. It will be seen that we follow those who think that by τῶν ἡγουμένων the Apostle meant not the *present*, but *former* guides, some of whom had since won for themselves the crown of martyrdom; he tells them to keep those holy men *constantly in mind* (μνημονεύετε) who had preached (ἐλάλησαν, not λαλοῦσιν) the Gospel to them, and to ponder well the upshot or final result (τὴν ἔκβασιν) of their Christian

Digitized by Google

Christian behaviour; language which, it appears to us, could only be appropriately applied to persons who had 'finished their course' in peace, and, like St. Stephen and St. James, 'after witnessing a good confession,' sealed their testimony with their blood.

REMARKS ON ROMANS IX. 3.

Love to Jesus is the mainspring of all right feeling and right acting on the part of the people of God. If this be removed or disordered, the whole machinery of Christian life will either stand still or move on very tardily and irregularly. Let this be in full and proper exercise, and all will move on in beautiful and God-like harmony. However a Christian feels, and whatever a Christian does, if it be in accordance with the mind of God, will also be in accordance with this. Whatever may occupy his mind, his tongue, his hands, or any of his powers, in reference to his fellow-men, will be regulated by this, and in subordination to it. Love to Jesus is a key by which the heart of the Christian may be unlocked, and all that passes within it, as well as all that appears in his life, be opened up and explained. This may be viewed as a test by which we may try every feeling and action of man; and all that does not fully accord with it must be pronounced unchristian. This may be viewed as a balance in which everything bearing the name of religion ought to be weighed, and all that is deficient in regard to it will be found wanting.

Such being the case, we may be sure that all the Apostle says in this verse is in full conformity with his love to Jesus. Whatever he says, regarding either the Jews or himself, must spring from, and be in subjection to, his affection for his Saviour. Nor are we left to gather this merely by way of inference; but looking at the connection in which the verse stands, we have clear and distinct proof on this point. It appears evident that all the Apostle says in the first verses of this chapter springs out of the concluding part of the foregoing chapter. There his theme is 'the love of Christ.' This, I apprehend, does not mean the love of Christ towards him, but his love towards Christ. He asks in holy confidence and joy, 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution?' etc. Now these things could have no tendency whatever in removing him from that love which Christ bore to him, but they might have a tendency in cooling his love for Christ. They were evils of no ordinary nature; he had them all to endure for the sake of

 Christ;

Digitized by Google

Christ; and he had but to cease from his attachment to Christ in order to be freed from them all: it was thus possible for them to separate him from the love of Christ in this sense. But the Apostle asks, 'Shall they do it?' and he answers, 'Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us.' That is, all these things shall not cause my love for Christ to cease, but I shall be conqueror and continue to love him still; and the ground of my assured conquest is, I know his love for me. From a soul thus wrought up to the highest pitch of ecstasy in love for Jesus he commences the 9th chapter. All he says, therefore, flows from that determined and ecstatic love for that Saviour who loved him.

While in this ecstasy of love for Christ, Paul calls to remembrance 'his brother, his kinsman according to the flesh.' He could not but recollect that the hatred and opposition of the Jews towards Christ were as firm and determined as was his own love; and that, while they were thus acting, they were in a state of enmity towards God, and exposing themselves to all the miseries of eternal perdition. Having these things before his mind, he breaks out in the bitterest grief, and exclaims, 'I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart,' etc.

In the first place, let us inquire a little more particularly into the cause of the Apostle's heaviness and sorrow. Is it the former condition and conduct of himself, or the present condition and conduct of the Jews? Does his grief arise from the fact that he formerly had set them a ruinous example, or from the fact that they were not following his present saving example? I have no doubt that a little consideration will make it plain, that it was the latter which caused the Apostle such grief of mind. This sorrow was occasioned by the determined hatred and opposition of his brethren towards Jesus, and the consequent ruin in which they were involving themselves. If he says anything regarding his own former condition, it is only because it is suggested to his mind by the sorrow he feels at viewing the present condition of the Jews.

1. I suppose it will be readily admitted that his brethren, in some way or other, formed the objects of his sorrow. There cannot be the smallest doubt of this. Whatever view we take of the passage, I am persuaded we must come to this conclusion. Whether his mind was fixed upon himself, setting them the example at one period of his life, or that he simply viewed them as rejecting that soul-saving gospel which he had received, we must come to the conclusion that he grieved because of them. This being admitted, it is most natural to suppose that he grieved because of their continued unbelief, and that his mind was fixed upon

Digitized by Google

upon this, than to suppose that he grieved because he once had set them a bad example. This view is borne out by the whole of what follows in the chapter, as well as the other parts of Paul's writings.

2. We have no certainty that the Jews did form the object of Paul's sorrow, unless we connect the latter part of verse 3 ('for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh') with verse 2, and view the former part of verse 3 as forming a parenthesis. The passage would then read thus: 'I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart, for my brethren,' etc. Reading it thus, we see at once who were the objects of Paul's sorrow; but if the 3rd verse be one continued sentence, and the whole of it form an absolutely necessary part of his argument, then it will be very difficult indeed to find out for whom he sorrowed, or why he sorrowed. We cannot suppose that he here tells the Church at Rome that his grief arose from the fact that he loved the Jews so much as to be willing (were it possible) to sacrifice himself for their sake. Now, according to the common rendering of the passage, if this be not the cause of his sorrow, we have it in no way expressed as to why he sorrowed, or for whom he sorrowed. It is not at all likely that such a reasoner as Paul would omit such an important point as the reasons why he had such grief; and as it is not at all possible that he could love the Jews in the manner supposed, and grieved because he thus loved them, we see the necessity of connecting the latter part of verse 3 with verse 2, in order to bring out who were the objects of his sorrow.

3. While Paul thus plainly expresses who were the objects of his sorrow, he does not expressly say why he sorrowed on their account. This he merely hints, and we have to gather it from the passage. When the passage is properly understood, there cannot be the smallest doubt as to why he had such grief because of the Jews; and to the people to whom the epistle was first addressed it could not fail to be perfectly plain. Still it is not fully expressed; and no doubt it was for wise reasons so designed by the Apostle. That he wished to let the Jews know that he sorrowed for them, and sorrowed for them because of their determined opposition to Jesus, and the consequent ruin they were bringing on themselves, we cannot doubt; and, though not directly expressed, it is clearly and distinctly conveyed in the language of the Apostle.

4. The whole of what the Apostle feels, hints, or expresses, come from a Christian heart. He is not telling the Jews what he once felt and said about them, when he was in an unconverted state, but what he feels and could say about them now that he had become a Christian. He views them from the foot of the Cross;

Digitized by Google

and all he says about them he says under the influence of that salvation which he is enjoying, and that love he had for that Saviour who had bestowed it upon him. The Apostle takes care to let this be distinctly known: 'I say the truth in Christ,'—that is, I in Christ,—I, a man saved by Christ,—I, a Christian, speak truth. 'I lie not in the Holy Ghost,'—that is, I in the Holy Ghost,—I, a man under the influence of the Holy Ghost, do not lie. It is of much importance to keep this in view, as it tends to throw some light over the first part of verse 3. Farther, the Apostle, as a Christian, spoke under the guidance of that love for Jesus, which he so joyfully and triumphantly refers to at the close of the foregoing chapter. This he wished to impress upon their minds—that he spoke as a person saved by Christ, and fully devoted to him.

Let us inquire, secondly, whether this sorrow which he felt for his brethren could lead him to wish to be accursed from Christ for their sakes. I cannot help thinking, that no circumstances could warrant Paul to have any such wish; and that a proper understanding of the passage will lead to the conclusion that no such wish is expressed here.

1. Such a wish would have involved a desire to devote himself to eternal ruin—a desire to have all that is contained in 'everlasting destruction' poured out upon himself. Such is the meaning of the word 'anathema,' rendered 'accursed;' something unredeemable, something devoted to eternal ruin. In all probability such is its meaning in all the places where it occurs in the New Testament, and if Paul says that, for the sake of his brethren, he could wish himself even accursed from Christ, he says that he could wish for all the horrors of an everlasting hell; that he might be overwhelmed with an Almighty, ever-burning wrath, and be blasted and ruined for ever. But surely it is unnatural (I would say impossible) for any man, calmly and deliberately, to wish any such thing, under any circumstances and on account of any object. Should it be replied, that Paul uttered this wish not in a calm and deliberate manner, but in the fervour of excitement, we will answer, that that very fervour is against the supposition that he could have such a wish. It was the fervour of love for Jesus, the fervour of a man guided by, and speaking under the influence of, the Holy Spirit. Such fervour could not betray Paul into any thing opposed to the interests of Jesus, and must have led him on in dignified calmness in all his thoughts and words. The soul of every man belongs to God, and is designed by God to be holy and happy, for ever in his service; and we cannot conceive that any circumstances can warrant a man to have any such wish as is here supposed to be expressed by the Apostle. If it would

Digitized by Google

would be wrong in any one, it is impossible to conceive that the Apostle, in his present state and feelings, could wish eternal ruin to himself. He knew that he was the property of Jesus; that his soul had been purchased by the inestimable price of the blood of Jesus; and that he was bound to glorify God for ever in eternal glory. We cannot conceive, therefore, that Paul could wish anything possible that would rob Jesus of his soul and himself of heaven. It is the duty of every man to be saved. God requires and commands every man to be saved, and it cannot be right for any man to wish himself unsaved.* Paul, therefore, could not have such a wish.

2. To be accursed from Christ supposes eternal hatred to Christ. Surely no one can have a doubt regarding this. Hell is made up of hatred to Jesus, and the souls who are suffering eternal miseries there are filled with the bitterest enmity to the Lord of Glory. As heaven may be summed up in perfect love to God, so hell may be summed up in consummate hatred to him. It is impossible to conceive of separation from Christ, and consequent destruction, without this. In a certain sense every unsaved man carries his own hell with him, and this hatred to Jesus will ever add fuel to the ever-burning fire, and strength to the ever-gnawing worm. If Paul, therefore, could wish for this destruction, for the sake of his brethren, he wished for eternal and ever-augmenting enmity to Jesus. It is not possible to suppose that this could be the case. We have seen that all he says here flows from a heart overflowing with the warmest love to Jesus; and it is impossible that a wish to hate him, and a wish to hate him eternally, could flow from this love, on account of any object whatever. It is the duty and the privilege of every human being to love Jesus, to love him supremely, to love him eternally; and no one can be excused or freed from this obligation. When a person becomes a Christian this love comes into exercise, and is the source of all right feeling and right acting toward his fellow-men. It is not supposable, as it implies contradiction, that any person can benefit his fellow-men by hating Jesus. Everything must be wrong, absolutely wrong, that does not flow from love to Jesus, or would in any way obstruct an increase of this love. Farther, it must be the continued wish of every Christian, in a proper state of mind, to have this love growing and augmenting within himself for ever. Such must have been the case with Paul; and it is impossible to conceive that he, while speaking under the influence of the Holy Spirit, could have any wish im-

* See the judicious and Scriptural remarks on this subject in the Number of this Journal for July, pp. 84-86.

plying

Digitized by Google

plying eternal enmity to Jesus. We are, therefore, led to the conclusion that he could not wish to be accursed from Christ for the sake of his brethren.

Let us now see what appears to be the meaning of this portion of the word of God:—

1. We view the first part of this 3rd verse, 'For I could wish myself were accursed from Christ,' as a parenthetic clause, thrown in by the Apostle, and on which his present argument does not absolutely depend. In this parenthetic clause Paul gives a short history of himself before his conversion.

2. We view *ηὐχόμην* used here in its most natural and common acceptation—referring to time past, 'I was wishing.' While the imperfect may be used for the optative, and is susceptible of such a rendering as our translators have given it in this verse; still it is by no means common, and it is much more natural to view it as referring to time past.

3. From the position of *αὐτὸς ἐγὼ*, these words seem to be connected with *ηὐχόμην*, and not with *ἀνάθεμα*; 'I myself was once wishing to be accursed,' and not 'I was wishing that myself were accursed.' *I* who am now a *Christian*, *I* who am now *saved by Christ*, *I* who have *now such love to Christ*, even *I* was once wishing.

4. Mark what Paul was once wishing. He was wishing to be accursed. Not accursed from Christ, but simply accursed. We view the words 'from Christ' as separate from the preceding word, and that there ought to be a comma after 'accursed.' Paul then says he was once wishing everlasting destruction to his soul. Even he who could now rejoice in a present salvation, was once wishing for all that is contained in the word 'anathema.'

5. But it may be asked, Was Paul really wishing for any such thing before conversion; seeing that even while a bigoted Pharisee and an opposer of Jesus and his cause, he must have been seeking for heaven? I apprehend Paul uses such language as we are in the habit of using daily. We frequently speak of men *choosing death, preferring hell to heaven, wishing their own eternal ruin*, etc., when they pursue a certain line of conduct. We do not mean that they are actually doing so, but they are doing what is equivalent to it. Sinners are said to *seek* destruction, Prov. xvii. 19; to *will* to die, Ezek. xxxiii. 11; to *love* death, Prov. viii. 36, etc.

6. Paul was thus wishing destruction to himself, in the way of living 'from Christ.' He was apart from Christ, separated from Christ; and by keeping himself thus, he was wishing eternal ruin to his soul. Thus he contrasts his former state with his present. Now he is *in* Christ, then he was *from* Christ; and even Paul who

Digitized by Google

who is now *in* Christ was once wishing for everlasting ruin by keeping himself *from* Christ.

7. In this short history of himself, Paul hints at the state of the Jewish people, and clearly brings out the reason why he sorrowed so much on their account. They were then what he once was. He knew well the condition in which they were, having once been in it himself. As he was once 'from Christ,' so were they; and if he, while 'from Christ,' was seeking destruction, he leaves them to apply it, that they were doing the same; and as he could not look back to his once awfully perilous condition without feelings of horror, he could not look on 'his brethren, his kinsmen according to the flesh,' being in the same condition without feeling the deepest sorrow.

D. D.

*** Since writing the above, an exposition of the ixth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, by the Rev. J. Morison of Kilmarnock, have come into my hand. There the reader will find this verse, with the other part of this somewhat perplexing chapter, fully, learnedly, and, I have no doubt, satisfactorily explained.

BIBLICAL TRUTH TESTED AND JUSTIFIED.

No. I.

Both persons and things may sustain temporary injury from accidental circumstances. Thus Job's reverses caused his integrity to be called in question, till Jehovah graciously 'turned his captivity;' and thus also Holy Writ has its assailants who condemn it for errors traceable merely to the erring hands of transcribers. Nor are such errors the evils some suppose, for those who make wisdom their parent know her unmingled excellence too well to stumble at what they know a proper explanation would set right: and, as to those who know not wisdom, the most they can do is to sound an alarm that shall summon to activity such evidence for Divine truth as has been slumbering for ages.

That accidental circumstances have created minor stumbling-blocks in the Sacred Volume may be seen on inspection; for though Josephus's reckoning backwards from the Babylonish captivity, giving 1062 years for Israel's departure from Egypt, and 1957 years for the Flood, rightly tells us that, in the Hebrew Bible, thus giving 895 years difference, it was written immediately after Gen. xi. 13, 'And Cainan lived thirty-eight years and had Salah,' yet the said Cainan's name is now omitted, not only in a part

Digitized by Google

part of existing Hebrew manuscripts, as in Josephus's time, but in all Hebrew manuscripts now known. Under such circumstances, he who reads Luke iii. 35, 36, finds Biblical truth unimpaired when Arphaxad, Cainan, and Salah appear respectively as father, son, and grandson in the Messianic line; while, from a cause hereafter to be explained, there is in the Hebrew and English of Gen. x. 24, Gen. xi. 12, and 1 Chron. i. 18, a contradiction to Luke's statement. Again, in 2 Kings viii. 26, we rightly read, 'Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign,' while elsewhere it is made out that the said Ahaziah was born two years before his father. For though Ahaziah's reign obviously commenced when Jehoram his father died at the age of forty, yet in 2 Chron. xxii. 2 it is said 'Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign.'

Under these circumstances the writer, having had experience in the collation of ancient manuscripts in different languages, avails himself of his observations of causes and effects to supply aid in cases which the usual course of Biblical criticism will not touch. In short, it may be said in reference to various readings, that where the cause of error can be satisfactorily discovered, that discovery is the discovery of truth.

Some transcribers have written from dictation, one instance of which the writer remembers when the phrase 'four fathers' was erroneously substituted for the word 'forefathers.' Other transcribers, as their corrected or uncorrected manuscripts show, have placed on their copy some object as a moveable index, which index not moved forward when it ought to be, causes an improper addition, or which, if moved too far in advance, occasions an improper omission, as in 2 Sam. v. 15, where we read, 'Elishua, and Nepheg' instead of 'Elishua, and Elpalet, and Nogah, and Nepheg,' as correctly given in 1 Chron. xiv. 5, 6. By a third class of transcribers, however, an index is made either of the writing last copied from, or else of what separates that writing from its sequel. If, therefore, the composition itself be regarded as *internal*, spaces, and all the diversities of interpointing, are *external*.

In such an aspect our attention is first solicited by internal similarity when one portion of composition in a transcriber's copy is his *eye-guide*, or guide to his next proper addition, while another portion of that composition is either a *counterpart* exactly corresponding with the said eye-guide, or else a *semblance* so far like the eye-guide as to be mistaken for it.

Leaving, therefore, other processes out of the question at present, the writer proceeds to the consideration of those that result from internal similarity, which processes are additive, omissive, transpositive, and substitutionary.

To

Digitized by Google

To illustrate these processes thousands of examples might be produced from manuscripts at the British Museum and elsewhere. But however proper diversified examples may be in some processes that may be considered hereafter, the processes now before the reader need no multiplied proofs of their existence.

No. 1.—*The Additive Process from Internal Similarity.*

A single example will suffice to illustrate No. 1, or The Additive Process from Internal Similarity.

An army comparable to the sands on the seashore is as nothing before Jehovah. Hence, though Benhadad, King of Syria, collected all his host and besieged Samaria, yet a supernatural sound, like that of the chariots and horsemen of an overwhelming confederacy of nations, made every individual of the Syrian host flee like the swift-winged arrow from their bow. Thus in 2 Kings vii. 7 the effect of fear on the Syrians is thus expressed in the English authorized version:—

'Wherefore they arose and fled in the twilight; and left their tents, and their horses, and their asses, even the camp as it was, and fled for their life.'

In Wickliff's Bible *derknessis* signifying *night's dark shades*, *her* signifying *their*, *castels* meaning *camp-apartments*, *oo* being sounded *oh* like *oo* in Dutch, and the Latin Vulgate being the basis of the translation, the said verse is thus expressed:—

'Therfor thei riseden and FLEDDEN in derknessis; and leften her tentis, and horsis, and mulis, and assis, in the castels, and thei FLEDDEN, coveitynge to save her lyves oonli.'

Nor is it difficult to see that when a transcriber has written all this verse excepting the last six words, the second word FLEDDEN which means *fled*, is his eye-guide, or what he looks into his copy for, as immediately preceding what he is to write next. If, however, his eye when directed to his copy so glances on the counterpart or first word FLEDDEN, as for him to mistake that counterpart for his eye-guide, he writes not only the seventh verse here given before and after a parenthesis, but he writes thus, with the parenthesis erroneously included:—

'Therfor thei riseden and FLEDDEN in derknessis; and leften her tentis, and horsis, and mulis, and assis, in the castels, and thei FLEDDEN (in derknessis, and leften her tentis, and horsis, and mulis, and assis, in the castels, and thei FLEDDEN,) coveitynge to save her lyves oonli.'

Such is what we find in Lands. 454, a manuscript written in black ink, and now deposited at the British Museum. And though the Additive Process, or wrong insertion of eighteen words, was

Digitized by Google

so discovered by the transcriber himself as for him subsequently to use the red ink, common in his manuscript, to draw a line through the sixth word and the seventeen words next following, yet this rectification has left the original error strikingly visible to the present day.

Having thus before us so clear an example of the Additive Process from Internal Similarity, it is perfectly reasonable to make that illustration of cause and effect an auxiliary in favour of Divine truth. For whilst, as shown in Ps. xix. 7, 'the law of the Lord,' or the statute-book of Jehovah, 'is perfect' in the surpassing wonders it achieves as a sequel to the Book of Creation, it will also be found to be perfect in itself. If, therefore, on such a life-sustaining tree anything imperfect is beheld, that imperfection is not the fruit of the tree, but only an excrescence which, by the aid of Providence, we may hope to be successful in removing.

On inspecting the Hebrew of 2 Sam. vi. 3, 4, and on availing ourselves of the assistance of the Septuagint, we perceive that before the Hebrew was translated into that ancient Greek, as given in the Codex Vaticanus, the passage was thus correctly expressed in the original :—

'And they set the ark of God upon a CART undesecrated by use; and they brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah: and Uzza and Ahio, sons of Abinadab, drove the CART with the ark of God; and Ahio went before the ark.'

Under these circumstances a transcriber having finished his writing with the phrase 'drove the CART,' made the second word CART his eye-guide, or what he looked into his copy for, as immediately preceding what he was to write next. His eye, however, when directed to his copy, happened so to glance on the first word CART, as for him to mistake that counterpart for his eye-guide, and thus erroneously to insert what is here given as a parenthesis when we thus express the two verses :—

'And they set the ark of God upon a CART undesecrated by use; and they brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah; and Uzza and Ahio, sons of Abinadab, drove the CART (undesecrated by use; and they brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah: and Uzza and Ahio, sons of Abinadab, drove the CART) with the ark of God; and Ahio went before the ark.'

As in Hebrew *a new cart* is called *a cart new*, that Hebrew order of words must be preserved in placing cause and effect before the English reader. But, when the facts of the case have been explained, the phrase 'a new cart' may be substituted for 'a cart undesecrated by use.' If, therefore, the reader takes up his

Digitized by Google

his English Bible, he will find 2 Sam. vi. 3 correct till he comes to the last two words, namely, 'new cart,' for which he ought to read 'cart' (as part of 'cart new' in Hebrew), and then to add no more of the 4th verse than the last eleven words, the first of them being *accompanying*, for which the word *with* may be advantageously substituted. Thus he who peruses the sacred volume no longer finds the ark twice brought out of the house of Abinadab, as he has been accustomed to read, but has what was original before him when he makes his English Bible thus express 2 Sam. vi. 3, 4:—

'And they set the ark of God upon a new cart, and brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah: and Uzza and Ahio, sons of Abinadab, drove the cart with the ark of God; and Ahio went before the ark.'

It is proper, however, to adduce another instance of the said Additive Process no less ancient, no less extensively transferred, and no less capable of satisfactory rectification.

The language contained in 1 Chron. ix. 34 ends with this assertion: 'These dwelt at Jerusalem,' or, as the Hebrew expresses the assertion both in 1 Chron. viii. 28 and in ch. ix. 34, 'These dwelt in Jerusalem.' This statement is perfectly correct in the former verse, being there applied to certain chief men of Benjamin; but when, in the latter verse, the same statement, even to a letter, is applied to chief men of Levi, correctness is not so obvious. For though the Levites had to abandon their cities in the territory of the ten tribes when the ten tribes revolted, yet, as we learn from 2 Chron. xi. 14, Judah, as well as Jerusalem, became their residence. Yea, as stated in Ezra ii. 70, 'The priests, and the LEVITES, and some of the people, and the singers, and the porters, and the Nethinim, dwelt in THEIR CITIES.' At this point, therefore, careful and devout examination is fairly called for. Nor will it be amiss to give a translation of the Hebrew not only literally, but also in the Hebrew order of words, with the exception of the phrase *paternal chiefs* for *chiefs of fathers*, and with the word *being* added as an equivalent of what is understood in Hebrew though not expressed. Thus, as the points to be observed are invisible in the English Bible, the English reader, by means of capitals for what coincides, is put in possession of those points by the following translation of the two verses in question:—

1 Chron. viii. 28. 'These are paternal chiefs, being, IN RESPECT TO THEIR GENERATIONS, CHIEF MEN.'

1 Chron. ix. 34. 'These are the paternal chiefs belonging to the Levites, being, IN RESPECT TO THEIR GENERATIONS, CHIEF MEN.'

With

Digitized by Google

With such coincidence in two distant passages, some Hebrew transcriber, having written the first book of Chronicles to ch. ix. 34, as far as that verse is here given, seems to have sought either refreshment or repose. Hence, when he resumed his task, the Hebrew word RASHIM, which means CHIEF MEN, or still more of the coinciding Hebrew,[a] being the portion of writing with which he finished, was sought by him in his copy as the guide to his next addition, when the coinciding Hebrew in 1 Chron. viii. 28 so caught his eye as for him to regard such counterpart the right prefix to what was to be written next. Thus the transcriber thinking he had found his eye-guide in 1 Chron. viii. 28, copied from that verse what followed, namely, 'THESE DWELT IN JERUSALEM,' and then went straight on from that 28th verse till he had finished the first book of Chronicles itself. Then the time of collation came, when he, like other transcribers, corrected all that presented itself to him as wrong.

In the case before us, however, such corrective process was imperfect; for though it properly cut off the last thirty-five verses of the erroneous addition, it left ten verses and a fragment to tell a tale which would have been untold without such residue.

If the reader, therefore, will take his English Bible and draw a line through the last four words in 1 Chron. ix. 34, and if he will also draw a line through all that follows to the end of the chapter, he will have what the original Hebrew was before an addition to it was innocently but erroneously made. Nevertheless, no real mischief is created by such excrescence, almost without a parallel in Holy Writ; for when it is said of the Levites referred to, '*These dwelt in Jerusalem*,' the assertion is partly true; and what follows not only serves for important collation, but, being a counterpart of truth, shows us how ten original verses, beginning with 1 Chron. viii. 29, have, for more than two thousand years, been like ancient gold coins, retaining, without essential loss, their original image and superscription. Thus what is not original serves to test and attest the original itself.

More than two millenniums ago a second specimen of the Additive Process from Similarity existed in the Hebrew of 2 Sam. v. 14-16, which Additive Process was, by translation, transferred to the Septuagint or ancient Greek version, as shown by the Codex Vaticanus. For in no other language but Hebrew could David's thirteen sons be erroneously made out twenty-six, as they

[a] The whole coinciding Hebrew, as those familiar with that language will see, is 'LE-THOLEDOTH-AM;' *le* signifying IN RESPECT TO, *tholedoth* signifying THE GENERATIONS, *am* meaning OF THEM, and *rashim* signifying CHIEF MEN.

were

Digitized by Google

were in that passage, owing to the first name of the thirteen being SHAMMUA, a Hebrew word which means HEARING, and which, occurring in 2 Sam. v. 14, became a *semblance* when SHAMMUA modified, or the Hebrew for HEARING, in the 17th verse, was an eye-guide. In our own idiom we begin a literal translation of that 17th verse thus: 'And the Philistines HEARING that they had anointed David king over Israel;' but in the Hebrew order of words, what the Hebrew itself expresses is, 'And HEARING the Philistines that they had anointed David king over Israel.' Thus, when verses were not distinguished as they are now, the last word of the 16th verse and the first two words of the 17th verse were 'ELIPHALET' and 'HEARING,' which word HEARING, being accounted by a transcriber the name of a fourteenth son, and being also the last word written by him, was sought by him in his copy, when his eye so glanced on HEARING expressed by SHAMMUA in the 14th verse, as for him to account that word SHAMMUA the prefix to what he ought to write next. Thus instead of properly terminating his enumeration with Eliphalet, David's thirteenth son, the transcriber wrote 'ELIPHALET, and SHAMMUA, and SHOBAB, and NATHAN, and SOLOMON,' etc., till thirteen sons too many were erroneously added.

In this case, therefore, the Vatican edition of the Septuagint is shown to be wrong, the Additive Process in Hebrew having obviously influenced the Greek translation at the very first; while the Hebrew now existing is, as far as the absence of improper repetition is concerned, shown to be original and right.

Contradictory diversity, therefore, has truly important uses, while, as a stumbling-block, it becomes like chaff before the wind. Thus we have the fair prospect that Biblical truth, pure as the finest gold, will ultimately have a glorious triumph. Yea, Jehovah himself says in Is. lv. 11, concerning the word that goeth out of his mouth, 'It shall not return to me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.'

No. 2, or *The Omissive Process from Internal Similarity*, is intended to be considered in a second paper.

J. F.

HEROD 'THE GREAT,' OR HEROD 'THE ELDER.'

IT is a known fact that, owing to the occasional practice among Greek and Roman writers of translating proper names into their respective languages, many historical names are involved in obscurity, in the elucidation of which criticism is not always successful.

Digitized by Google

ful. These writers have often, by misunderstanding the signification of names, wrongly translated them, and we moderns, by retranslating their renderings into our own languages, have ascribed to persons epithets which were never given them by their contemporaries. The discrepancies thereby arising from the comparison of the accounts of historical personages with the splendid epithets conferred are often striking, and have not rarely called forth animadverting remarks from historians. Such a personage is Herod, generally styled 'the Great.' It is very difficult to say by what merits or acts he could have deserved that epithet. From what we know from history he by no means possessed in an eminent degree any of those qualities which are likely to acquire for the possessor the name of Great. As a vassal of the Romans he cannot even be considered as an independent king. But this anomaly disappears when we consider the epithet μεγας (ascribed by him to Josephus, and translated into Latin by 'Magnus,' and consequently into English and other languages by 'Great,') as a rendering of the Syriac and Hebrew 'Rabbah,' meaning the 'Numerous' or 'Old.' It is known that Herodes had several descendants of the same name (Jos., *Ant.*, book xviii. 85. 4); and what is more natural than that, in order to distinguish Herodes from his namesakes, the Jews should have called him 'Herodes Rabbah,' that is, 'Herodes the Elder?' Josephus, by translating this epithet into μεγας, may have followed the analogy of μεγαλομητηρ wherein μεγαλο is taken in the signification of 'old,' as are the words 'grand' and 'gross' in the English and German—'grandmother, grossmutter.' That the epithet 'Rabbah' was applied to the grand-parents in the popular dialect about that time spoken by the Jews is expressly stated in the Talmud (Yebamoth, f. xxi. p. 2), and it is certainly not the fault of Josephus that his translation from his native tongue into Greek should have been misunderstood, and consequently mistranslated.

Perhaps the Syrian king known by the name of Antiochus the Great (Magnus) is likewise indebted for this epithet to a misunderstanding of the Syrian 'Rabbah,' possibly given to him in Syria in contradistinction from his immediate descendants, also called 'Antiochus.'[a]

The misunderstanding of the word 'Rabbah,' however, did not originate with either Josephus or later writers. It is as old as the Septuagint, which renders (Josh. xi. 8, xix. 28) the Hebrew 'Zidon Rabbah,' ἑως Σιδῶνος τῆς μεγλης.' The Hebrew for great is 'GADOL,' and this word we find used when applied to a

[a] See *Rerum Chemid*, vol. vii. p. 201.

great

Digitized by Google

great town (Gen. x. 12); and certainly, if it be considered that Sidon, as far as we know, is nowhere spoken of as a large town, but that it was a very ancient place (it existed already in the time of Jacob, Gen. xlix. 13), I think the epithet 'old' is much more applicable than that of great. The circumstance that there were two cities of the name of Tyrus, of which the elder was called ἡ παλαιτυρος or παλαιτυρος (Diod. Sec. xvii. 40), is suggestive that the same may have been the case with Sidon, and at the same time accounted for the epithet 'Rabbah.'

That the term רַב (the masculine of רַבָּה) denotes 'old' and not 'great,' is also clear from Gen. (xxv. 23), where, in the words 'and the elder shall serve the younger,' צָעִיר (younger) is used in contradistinction from רַב (the elder), as correctly rendered in the Anglican version. A. B.

THE MARK UPON CAIN.

'And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him.'—Gen. iv. 15.

MANY interpret this passage as teaching that God put some visible mark upon the person of Cain, thus distinguishing him as an object of God's judicial anger; and intimating the Divine will that whatever hostility men might have towards him, they should not take away his life. So Calvin:[a] '*Scripture being silent as regards the character of this sign, commentators have confectured that it must have been a bodily affection like palsy. It is sufficient for us that some visible symbol did exist*, which might operate as a check on the violence of passion in those who beheld him.' Winer says:[b] '*By the word* אוֹת *the author of the narrative probably means some extraordinary mark on the person of Cain.*' This view I believe is that of the majority of interpreters.

But there is a great difficulty in perceiving how such a mark on the person of Cain would have answered the end for which those who take this view think it was intended. How could men generally know what it meant? The more immediate descendants of Adam might understand its meaning, but as the human family at that early period increased with astonishing rapidity, it is not probable they would all ever have seen Cain, and be in-

[a] Quale autem signum fuerit, quia non exprimit Scriptura divinarunt interpretes, corpus ejus fuisse tremulum. Nobis sufficiat visible aliquod symbolum extitisse, quod nocendi libidinem et audaciam in spectatoribus reprimeret.

[b] Unter אוֹת dachte der Verf. jener Relation warscheinlich irgend ein auffallendes Zeichen an dem Leibe Kains.

structed

Digitized by Google

structed into the intent of this mark. In order, ')the signifi- being of any value it must have been accompanied ... terns, by tion of its meaning. Besides, would ungodly men have respected it? If not, it would have been useless. The opinion of those who understand the language as intimating that God gave him a sign in confirmation of his declaration, that it should not be to him as he suspected; that every one who found him should kill him, seems much preferable. God had pronounced sentence against him. Under a sense of guilt he now dreads he should become the object of universal hatred, and that every one with whom he should come in contact should consider himself as called upon to avenge his crime. God assures him that this would not be the case; that whoever should imbrue his hands in his blood, should be guilty of murder more aggravated even than that of which he had been guilty, inasmuch as it would be committed in opposition to greater light, the awful enormity of murder being much more evident after the open expression of the Divine displeasure in the case of Cain. God therefore declared that whoever should commit murder upon him should expose himself to punishment sevenfold greater than that which he had brought upon himself; and assures him that his apprehensions would not be realized, and in confirmation of this assurance he gives him a sign. The Old Testament history abundantly shows that it was no unusual thing for God to confirm his declarations in this manner. Compare Gen. ix. 12, Gen. xvii. 11, Exod. iii. 12, Judges vi. 17, 36, 2 Kings xx. 8. In all these passages the word נתן is employed. The word שים has the sense of *to place, to appoint, to give;* and when followed by ל with the *acc.*, it obtains the sense of *to exhibit somewhat to one.*

The rendering of the LXX. is happy, and seems to favour the view I have taken: καὶ ἔθετο Κύριος ὁ Θεος σημειον τῳ Καϊν, τοῦ μη ανελεῖν αὐτον πάντα τον ευρίσκοντα αὐτον. Had the authors of the Septuagint version understood the expression in the sense of a mark put on the person of Cain, I think it is highly probable they would have used the preposition επὶ or ἐν, and I am inclined to think were such the correct interpretation, we should have בו instead of ל in the original Hebrew. Compare Exod. xxxii. 15, Ezek. ix. 4, 6.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Digitized by Google

great town
Sidon, as

CORRESPONDENCE.

ON THE MIRACLE OF JOSHUA.

To the Editor of the Journal of Sacred Literature.

DEAR SIR,—For the sake of Biblical truth, I beg you will permit me to offer, through your columns, a few remarks in reply to Mr. Taylor's strictures upon my interpretation of Joshua x. 12-14, which I find inserted in the seventh Number of your Journal, and which would appear to me to chiefly rest on a series of misconceptions on the part of your correspondent.

I confess I do not understand how the principle of 'the necessary qualification of a miracle being its answering some grand, lasting, and ostensible purpose,' can be

'fitted to create the wish that the miracle related in the 10th chapter of Joshua had not been related there at all.'

Certainly no such wish is reflected in my paper; nor will it be found in the slightest degree to justify the remark, that

'it does not appear to be in general a safe method of interpreting even uninspired writings, to commence by an attempt to determine, on *à priori* grounds, what the writer ought, or what he was likely, *to say*; far less is it admissible in the study of the Holy Scriptures.'

The very thought of speculations so absurd is preposterous. My inquiry has been directed to the sole and legitimate object of *ascertaining* what the sacred writer HAS SAID, according to

'the sound principle of inductive philosophy, that we must base our theories on *previously ascertained facts*, instead of attempting to square facts into accordance with preconceived theories;'

but I apprehend it is in diametrical opposition to his own principle, that Mr. Taylor, immediately afterwards, first defines 'the *facts* of the Bible interpreter' as 'the words of Scripture in their unforced grammatical meaning,' and then *à priori* identifies that 'unforced grammatical meaning' with his preconceived theory. This is indeed *making human prejudice the standard of divine truth.*

'It is not clear,' he continues, 'that the interpretation of the present passage would *ever* have been considered doubtful, but for the previous (and perhaps unconscious) application to it of the principle in question,' [the principle respecting the necessary qualification of a miracle].

Such a remark cannot but surprise. The writer himself admits 'the want of express references to this miracle in the later portions of Scripture.' The two earliest personages who interpret our passage in a supernatural sense, are Jesus the son of Sirach, in his apocryphal book

Digitized by Google

book מִשְׁלֵי, come down to us in a later Greek *translation* under the title of Σοφία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σειράχ, Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), and the marvel-loving historian Josephus. In subsequent times their view was adopted by only a very limited number of Jewish rabbis. *For a period extending over at least a thousand years, immediately following the composition of the book of Joshua*, we have thus the most satisfactory historical reason to conclude *no miraculous construction was put upon the passage of which we speak.* On a similar *silence of history* we unhesitatingly reject some of the idolatrous doctrines of the Church of Rome, nor could we reject them upon more solid grounds; but the condemning principle which applies to the innovations of Romish bishops, applies with double force to the new-fangledness of a Jesus Sirach and a Josephus and their followers. Let it be remembered that there is *a neology* in the sight of Error which is true orthodoxy in the judgment of Truth.

When Mr. Taylor states—

'We must altogether demur to the assertion that "the necessary qualification of a miracle is its answering some grand, lasting, and ostensible purpose," if by this be meant that every miracle which God enables his servants to perform, must have an ostensible purpose, of which the grandeur and duration shall be apparent *to* us. Tried by this rule, not a few even of our Saviour's miracles would become incredible,'—

he can hardly have maturely considered the opinion he here expresses; and unless he is prepared to maintain that God would suspend the eternal laws of his creation for no other purpose than that (I speak with due reverence) of puzzling the human mind, and leading it to indulge in those 'endless conjectural possibilities' of which your correspondent gives us so fair a specimen, even he himself cannot consistently defend the view he would seem to entertain in regard to miracles. As to the particular one in question, he entirely overlooks that Joshua's address to the sun not only *had* an ostensible purpose, but that this purpose is also expressly alluded to by the sacred writer, and therefore leaves no room for conjecture at all. His assertion that, tried by my rule of the necessary qualification of a miracle, not a few even of our Saviour's miracles would become incredible, is manifestly based on a twofold error. Firstly, the miracles of our Saviour *were* worked for the grand, lasting, and ostensible—*to us* ostensible—purpose of testifying his divine mission;[a] and, secondly, a miracle as a fact cannot possibly, in virtue of its very nature, be 'incredible.' But 'to doubt the veracity of the distinctly written word of God, we hold to be as sinful,' I remarked in my essay, 'as we hold it to be sinful to accept, without due inquiry, as a divine miracle that which may have no other foundation than human ignorance or prejudice.' Surely the rebuke the Scribes and Pharisees met with, when demanding 'a sign' from our Lord (Matt. xii. 39), ought not to be lost upon us. Mr. Taylor's illustration of his argument, by the undiscovered use of the spleen, is not a happy one. If it were—that is, if the presumed miracle of Joshua, in-

[a] See the declaration of Christ himself, St. John xi. 42.

stead

Digitized by Google

stead of being *a problem*, were as palpable *a fact* as the spleen is—both illustration and argument would have been superfluous.

Your correspondent thinks that *the very promise of victory* given by God to Joshua, WARRANTED him (because 'the divinely enlightened eye of the general' perceived that he could not comfortably, *before sunset* on that day, destroy his enemies—children, like himself, of that Great Being to whom he addressed himself) in asking, simply for the sake of his convenience, a temporary *suspension of the laws of the Universe!* What is there so high or so low, within the wide range of human fancy, that we should not, upon this principle, be *warranted* in demanding of God, if once it pleased Him to grant us a request? So, when Mr. Taylor adds—

'The *fighting of the Lord* for Israel appears to us to be an expression quite as applicable to the miraculous *staying of the sun* in his course as to the destructive storm of hail,'—

we must, on similar unprincipled conjectures and gratuitous opinions opposed to conclusive arguments, waive all comment.

With the view of Sir Isaac Newton as to the erroneous assumption that the sacred writers should have framed their language in accordance with the real instead of the apparent (then alone intelligible) motions of the heavenly bodies, I so far quite agree; but I do not think that the general principle here laid down is applicable to the particular case under consideration. Whether we suppose that God had granted to Joshua His divine power to perform the assumed miracle, previously to the Jewish general attempting it (and which, as Calvin truly remarks, is the only admissible supposition), or whether we assume that God himself arrested the earth in its course at the command of Joshua, it would follow that, in the latter case, *God had entered into the error of Joshua*, or in the former, that the *sun* had *disobeyed* the Divine command, and, as it were, transferred it to the *earth*. A very different thing, it appears to me to be, a sacred historian describing some phenomenon of nature in the vulgar though erroneous language of the time; or a momentary representative of God, endowed with His infinite power, commanding, IN DIRECT TERMS, a creature or instrument of His will. The language thus employed becomes the language of God; and under such circumstances to entertain the idea of an error *of any kind*, more especially a *gratuitous* one, which by the change of a single expression might have been avoided, is imputing an error to the Unerring One.

'We may call attention to the remarkable circumstance,' Mr. Taylor further observes, 'that the narrative represents Joshua as commanding not the sun only, *which would have been sufficient for his purpose*, but the moon also, to stand still—a fact not easily explicable save on one of two suppositions: either that the ancient Israelites believed that the whole vault of heaven revolved round the earth, carrying the sun and moon along with it—a miracle this that must have appeared to them at least as stupendous as a pause in the rotation of the earth; or,' etc.

I might argue that nothing could point out more forcibly the purely poetical character of our passage than the former part of this objection does; but must I tell Mr. Taylor that the ancient Hebrews *did* believe

Digitized by Google

that all the heavenly bodies—sun, moon, and stars, *as a whole*—revolved round the earth? They considered it no miracle for the simple reason for which even Plato and Aristotle did not, and for which we in our turn look upon the evolution of the planets round the sun as no miracle—the reason of being ACCUSTOMED *to such an idea.*

That

'the negative objection [to the miracle], drawn from the want of express references to it in the later portions of Scripture, cannot prove, in opposition to the obvious meaning of this narrative, that it is not recorded here,'

would be a correct remark, were not 'the obvious meaning of the narrative' precisely *the point at issue;* but the silence of Sacred History for a long series of centuries is, though to Mr. Taylor's opinion but a negative objection, yet, in regard to the true sense of our passage, a positive fact, against which no mere opinion can possibly maintain itself.

I will not stop to notice those little misrepresentations by which your correspondent ushers in the last part of his reply, as only calculated to detract from what trifling value *might* be attached to my paper, but not to affect the real question. Nor need I say that our still imperfect knowledge of the Hebrew language, and the consequent difficulty we experience in arriving at the correct meaning of certain Biblical passages, is most assuredly no reason, as he asserts, why 'our faith in the sincerity of Scripture language should be overthrown,' or why 'we should renounce in despair the idea of being able to discover with certainty the meaning of the plainest portion of the word of God.' In the same manner we can but smile, when, with my version of the passage actually before him, he 'cannot admit that even the *possibility* of a new interpretation has been evinced.' But without further preamble, I will proceed to examine his 'attempt *to show* that the proposed rendering is utterly inadmissible.'

His *only* argument to this effect is that the Hebrew particle אֲשֶׁר cannot correctly be translated 'because;' yet, whilst indulging in grammatical *speculations,*[b] Mr. Taylor silently passes over *the reasons* adduced by me, and *taken from the context of Scripture* (the true foundation of Scriptural grammar), which compel us, in the passage under discussion, to take אֲשֶׁר in the sense of 'because;' and whilst he alludes to 'the absence of *any* proof of this alleged use of the particle,' and again questions the accuracy of the statement that אֲשֶׁר is ever a conjunction meaning 'because,' he chooses to leave *the proofs under his eyes* altogether *unnoticed.* I was wrong in stating that in the passage Jer. xxii. 15, &c., אֲשֶׁר had by our translators of the Bible been rendered 'because;' but it was assuredly no '*lapsus calami,*' as your correspondent

[b] On the other hand Mr. Taylor very justly points to the erroneous use of the *pluperfect,* made in my translation of ver. 12. Instead of 'because Joshua, on the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, *had prayed* to the Lord,' the passage ought to be rendered, 'Because that Joshua *prayed* to the Lord on the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel.' This construction reads all the better, and the correction in no wise affects my argument.

Digitized by Google

spondent thinks, which made me refer to that passage as a *further* proof in support of my argument. In this I have no less an authority on my side than GESENIUS (*Handwörterb.*, sub voce אָז No. 3), who moreover adduces Ps. xl. 8 as another instance. The verses 15 and 16 of the 22nd chapter of Jeremiah, which at the time were more especially present to my mind, deserve for a moment to arrest our attention. I will here transcribe the text, the authorized version and the corrected translation in collateral columns, marking those words added to *complete the sense of the text* by italics, and those *arbitrarily* added by placing them between brackets :—

אָבִיךָ הֲלוֹא אָכַל וְשָׁתָה וְעָשָׂה מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה אָז טוֹב לוֹ׃ דָּן דִּין־עָנִי וְאֶבְיוֹן אָז טוֹב הֲלוֹא־הִיא הַדַּעַת אֹתִי נְאֻם־יְהוָה׃	Did not thy father eat and drink, and do judgment and justice, [and] then [it was] well with him? He judged the cause of the poor and needy; then [it was] well [with him]: *was* not this to know me? saith the Lord.	Did not thy father practise hospitality, and administer law and justice, because to him precious things? He pleaded the cause of the poor and the oppressed, because *a* good *cause: was* not this to know me? saith Jehovah.

As the scholar will at once perceive that my version is in strict accordance with Hebrew lexicography, I will forbear offering any further comment on this passage: it speaks for itself. As evidently as here, is 'because' the meaning of אָז in the passages—1 Kings ix. 11; Ps. xl. 8, xcvi. 12; Job iii. 13, ix. 31, &c. &c., the latter of which, it will be found, is again not quite correctly rendered by our translators. 'I know that thou wilt not' (we should read from verse 28) 'hold me innocent. I, who shall be held guilty, were I to wash myself in snow-water and purify my hands in a well, to what purpose should I do this vain thing? Because thou wilt cast me into a pit,' etc.

Whenever אָז is used in the Bible in the strict sense of 'at that time' (for instance, Gen. xii. 6), it must be regarded as the accusative of the *noun*. As an *adverb* proper, it possesses a double power—prospective and retrospective. According to the latter, in which it exclusively occurs at the *commencement* of a new sentence or period, it bears the meaning of 'thereupon,' '*in sequence* (upon which);' according to the former, in which it occurs only in the *middle* of a period, it assumes the meaning of '*in sequence* (of),' i. e. *because*. I confess I am unable herein to perceive 'a strange idiom,' 'a remarkable construction,' for almost every language presents the most striking analogies to it; and though I am aware that the view I have just expressed of אָז is quite a novel one, yet I venture to submit it, with some degree of confidence, to the judgment of better grammarians than myself, and more particularly to that of your correspondent.

To encounter his remaining objections :—

'Without waiting,' he writes, 'to enlarge on the obvious remark, that the staying of the *moon* is wholly unaccounted for in this [Talmudical] quotation, we must, in the first place, protest in the strongest manner against the attribution to the venerable personages of Old Testament history of the modern absurdities of the Talmud.'

The 'obvious remark' in regard to the moon has already been met.

In

Digitized by Google

In order to understand Scripture, it is indispensable to know not only the *language*, but also the habits, manners, customs, *ideas*, *views*, etc., of the Hebrew people in those remote times. The Talmud is, next to the Bible itself, the chief source whence that knowledge can be derived. How pitifully would our LIGHTFOOT smile in his grave if he could hear Mr. *Taylor's* 'protest'! And to accuse a poet of being nothing but 'an inflated utterer of wild bombast,' and a prose writer of being guilty of 'inconceivable absurdity and shameful deception,' because, forsooth, they have been misinterpreted by a posterity, during centuries neglectful, and therefore ignorant of, and even now but imperfectly acquainted with, their language! What must, in Mr. Taylor's estimation, be the writers of the Egyptian hieroglyphics? He continues:

'And, fourthly, granting that it was merely until the people should avenge themselves on their enemies, that Joshua called on the sun and moon to stand still, we cannot see how this interferes with the established interpretation at all. It is evidently the very thing understood by every ordinary reader as Joshua's motive for the miracle performed.'

That the reader generally *implies* this sense may be as true as it is true that the authorized version does not *express* it. According to the interpunctuation of the latter, 'both sun and moon, supposing God to have given effect to the command of Joshua, ought to have remained stationary from that moment for all future ages.' I believe myself to have pointed out, for the first time, the true grammatical construction of the sentence.

Mr. Taylor is in error, and again misrepresents me, when he states—

'It is asserted, lastly, that it is not absolutely necessary to translate the words כְּיוֹם תָּמִים, as in our version, "*about* a whole day;" but that they *may be made* to accord with the naturalistic view of the passage by rendering them "*it seemed* a whole day." Now, not to speak of the curious psychological phenomenon of one short hour *seeming* to soldiers in the heat of battle as long as a whole day, we remark that the expression "*it seemed*" conveys a great deal more meaning than is at all admissible as a literal rendering of the little particle כְּ.'

Is 'about,' perchance, 'a *literal* rendering of the *little* particle כְּ?' I have shown, by positive and indubitable proofs from Scripture, that its *fundamental* meaning is what a thing *seems to be*, not that this meaning may be *made* to accord with it. Neither did I say that 'the short space of one hour had seemed to the *soldiers in the heat of battle* as long as a whole day' (although such would by no means have been a curious 'psychological phenomenon'), but expressly stated, 'The sudden and irresistible attack of the Israelites during mid-day, at once decided the contest in so incredibly short a time, *it appears to the narrator* as if' (and this term, used by our own translators of the Bible for כְּ, may, if judged preferable to 'it seemed,' be substituted for it) 'the sun, instead of an hour, had tarried in the midst of heaven a whole day.'

'The principle involved in his arguments,' Mr. Taylor concludes, 'if once admitted may, and in consistency must, be extended to many of the other miracles recorded in the word of God, perhaps even to most of them, if not to all. The interests at stake are too momentous to be left thus at the mercy of an erroneous principle.'

Digitized by Google This

This principle is—TO ASCERTAIN THE REAL MEANING OF THE WORD OF GOD, and not blindly to accept *human prejudice as the standard of divine truth.* To do this, to receive any Biblical passage in a sense put upon it BY TRANSLATORS, which, according to sound grammatical rules, it will not, and according to the most conclusive INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF SCRIPTURE, it cannot bear, simply because, after a lapse of centuries, the new-fangled view of some writer or other has adopted such an interpretation, and that new-fangledness has partially been sanctioned by subsequent ages; to do this, I hold to be as sinful as I should hold it to be to doubt the veracity of the Eternal One Himself. And in accordance with that principle, I can but, in answer to Mr. Taylor's implied charge of neology, emphatically reiterate, that *there is a neology in the sight of Error which is true orthodoxy in the judgment of Truth.* In regard to the question discussed, this judgment, I venture to think, stands thus far recorded in my favour. Certainly my arguments have not been shaken by your correspondent, though perhaps for the sole reason not, that *in no single instance* has he fairly *met them:* he observing, in regard to some of the most important ones, a perfect silence, and opposing to others his mere opinion, or else indulging, without reference to any of them, in 'conjectural possibilities' out of place, grammatical speculations, occasional misrepresentations, and insinuated charges of neology. This is not a method 'favourable to an impartial investigation of the truth,' nor a proper way to discuss 'momentous interests.' To me Mr. Taylor owed undoubtedly no apology for 'the controversial tone of what he has written,' because I shall at all times and under any circumstances be willing to accept information and to stand corrected, by sound arguments, of such erroneous opinions as I may emit; but whether, as he himself states that he 'had nothing *new* to advance on the subject,' he ought not rather to have apologized both to your readers for submitting to them what they must necessarily be supposed to have known already, and to yourself for causing me to trouble you with this reply, is a question which I must leave to them and to you to answer.

J. VON GUMPACH.

BURIAL WITH CHRIST BY BAPTISM.

(To the Editor of the Journal of Sacred Literature.)

DEAR SIR,—The remarks of the Rev. D. Drummond, in No. VIII. of this Journal, in review of my article on Col. ii. 12, do not appear to me to call for a lengthened reply. Indeed he admits that I showed 'most satisfactorily that this passage of Scripture does not, and cannot refer to the mode of baptism'—which was the leading object of this article. One would naturally suppose that after this he would have deemed a reply from him uncalled for. But he thinks he has discovered some 'considerable obscurity' in the article, and, *mirabile dictu!* he has written a longer one for the purpose of pointing it out. He

Digitized by Google

He might have satisfied himself with a private note to the author, drawing his attention to this obscurity, and hoping that in future he would adopt a more lucid style. As it is, we beg to refer our readers to the article in No. VI., leaving them to judge whether the obscurity is there.

Mr. D. notices only 'two points' as the foundation of his charge. 1st. We had said that 'the expression *ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι, by baptism*, is here employed to signify the means,' etc., but he quotes only the half of the sentence. If he had quoted the whole, he could not have produced the preposterous suppositions with which he begins; and, when he quotes the remainder on the following page, he presents himself in a most awkward light to the reader. He seems not to make allowance for the brevity of 'critical' remarks. We refer him, for illustration of such brevity, to Bloomfield's *Notes* on the Greek New Testament, or the *Scholia* of Rosenmüller. And, in regard to this particular expression, we refer him to Professor Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, where, under Ἐν, he will find the tropical use illustrated by the following particulars:—1. Of the *state;* 2. The *mode;* 3. The *ground;* 4. 'The *means*, by the aid or intervention of which anything takes place, is done; *in*, that is, by means of;' to which is appended the remark, 'In New Testament and later writers simply of the *instrument*, where classic writers usually employ the dative alone.'

His remarks about 'an internal baptism' we allow to go for what they are worth.

The 2nd point on which the charge of obscurity is founded is the expression that 'faith receives its efficacy from the operation of God.' Now this remark does not fully express the meaning intended, but even Mr. D. admits that, taken in connection with what follows, the meaning is not obscure. It is immediately added, 'that he by whose agency faith is produced in the minds of believers is the same God,' etc. We would take exception here to some of the expressions used by Mr. D. on this point, could we suppose that this would be in the least degree interesting or useful to the reader. We agree, however, with the following, which we were surprised to read after all his apparent opposition to our views:—'No doubt the faith mentioned in this text is the belief of soul-saving truth, and the efficient working of God was needed in order that this faith might be produced.'

Mr. D. thrice gives the expression *ἐν ᾧ βαπτίσματι*, which does not exist in the Greek language. At first we thought it a mere typographical error, and blamed the printer, as it occurs in a quotation (*ᾧ* being put for *τῷ*); but as he gives it twice afterwards, we were forced to conclude that it was a blunder of the writer.

We may be allowed to hint, in parting, that, when Mr. D. writes again, he should not occupy his paper with remarks on the mere form of a writer's expression, for which the general reader cares nothing.

Coldstream, Dec. 17, 1849. P. MEARNS.

NOTICES

Digitized by Google

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Posthumous Works of the Rev. Thos. Chalmers, D.D., LL.D. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D. Vols. vi.—ix. Sutherland and Knox, Edinburgh: 1849. pp. xvii., 484; xx., 512; 499; l., 498.

These are the concluding volumes of the Posthumous Works of the illustrious Chalmers. The *Sermons*, which form volume vi., furnish specimens of his pulpit discourses from the earliest to the latest stages of his ministry. Several of them were preached frequently on public occasions, and seem to have been regarded by himself as his great sermons. Those who never had the happiness of hearing this most popular of preachers will not be surprised at his popularity when they read these discourses.

The series forms an important contribution to the religious biography of the author—his intellectual and moral history. The first sermon (text, Mic. vi. 8) was written in January, 1798, as a Divinity Hall class exercise, a year and a half ere he received licence to preach the Gospel. The propriety of publishing this and the following six has been questioned. The author assails the views of the Evangelical party, which he afterwards so warmly espoused, and so eloquently advocated. But the editor says that he has not introduced 'those earlier sermons in which the fullest and most vehement utterance is given to the strong dislike which he at that time cherished to the doctrines of free grace, and to the style of character and conduct exhibited by many of the most zealous of their advocates.' (p. xvi.) Yet the earlier sermons of this volume give sufficiently strong indications of 'those fatal misapprehensions of the great doctrine of justification by faith only, which were cherished by him during the first ten years of his ministry—against which he was afterwards all the better fitted to guard others, because of his being so long misled by them himself.' He is liable to the charge of misrepresenting the views he opposes—a fault common with controversialists; but the following sentences possess a high degree of interest, as from the youthful pen of one who subsequently did more than any other to render evangelical preaching popular in Scotland:—

'We consider the faith of Christianity to be the humble assurance of an honest mind which grounds its confidence on the consciousness of its own sincerity, on the view of the Divine goodness, and on the contemplation of those provisions which the Author of nature hath made for the encouragement of erring mortals. But the perverters of the truth as it is in Jesus have determined that to be the saving faith which none but the presumptuous can entertain; not that faith which worketh by love, which purifieth the heart, and which overcometh the world, but that faith which, according with the pride of their minds, elevates them in their own esteem as the peculiar favourites of heaven. This faith (horrible to relate) they carry about

Digitized by Google

about with them as an amulet against the reproaches of a guilty conscience, and thus do they stifle the feelings of nature, and check the sentiments of virtue.'—p. 10.

These juvenile productions are exceptionable in point of doctrine, but, in every other respect, they are greatly superior to what we would have expected from the author at that early period.

The sermon on the French invasion is spirit-stirring, and must have produced a thrilling effect.

The year 1810 has been called the 'transition period' in the religious history of Dr. Chalmers. Various circumstances contributed to the remarkable change he then underwent. Death had thrice invaded the circle of his nearest relationship, and he too had been confined by illness to his room for nearly half a year; so that his thoughts were forcibly turned to death and eternity. He was also engaged preparing the article 'Christianity' for the Edinburgh Encyclopædia; and in this work the character, life, and death of the primitive Christians became the object of an intensely interesting contemplation. His mind was characterised by native nobleness, but, from this period, the hallowing influence of genuine piety is apparent in all his discourses. His prayers, discourse, and address at the communion of that year are here presented, and they indicate a spirit of piety as profound as it is decided.

A long and admirable sermon on the 'Living Water,' prepared and preached in 1812 (as we learn from one of those interesting notices prefixed to most of the discourses), may be taken as a specimen of the evangelical fulness which now began to characterise his pulpit ministration.

That on the 'Right Fear and the Right Faith' is full of lively and pointed illustrations, and seems admirably characteristic of the author. It reminds us more of what we have heard from his lips than any in the volume.

The 'Sacramental Sermon,' on 2 Cor. vi. 17, 18, is fervent and soul-stirring. We cite the following sentences from one of the most eloquent passages in the volume:—

'You could not, my brethren, you could not carry me to any one haunt of wickedness so deeply sunk in the lowest and the loathsomest of sin's abominations, where I would not forget my office as the messenger of a beseeching God, did I not lift my testimony to his willingness to receive all and to forgive all. You could not point my eye to a single wanderer so far gone from the path of obedience that the widely sounding call of reconciliation cannot reach him. You could not tell me of a heart so hard and so impenitent that I must not try to soften it by the moving argument of a God waiting to be gracious. Aye, it may have made many a stout resistance to other arguments—it may have defied every warning, and sheathed itself in impenetrable obstinacy against every threatening, and smothered every conviction by plunging the whole man into a deeper and more desperate rebellion, and when all the terrors of the Lord were brought in mustering array against it, it may have gathered itself up into a sterner attitude of defiance, and put on a darker scowl of alienation.—Oh, can nothing now be done to storm the citadel that has all along held out so impregnably? Has the ambassador of God exhausted his quiver of all its arguments? and must the poor child of infatuation be left without an effort more to rescue him from the perdition he so determinedly clings to? The text supplies me with one other argument. It puts into my mouth the very

Digitized by Google

very substance of that Gospel which has so often proved itself the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation. It unrobes God of all unrelenting severity, and directs my eye to the Monarch of the Universe seated on a throne of mercy, and pleading for the return of his strayed creatures with every accent of tenderness. He speaks to them with the longings of a father bereaved of his children. He descends to the language of intreaty—the great God of heaven and of earth knocks at the door of every rebellious heart, and begs admittance. That heart which all the terrors of God could not force to repentance, He now plies with the goodness of God that He may lead it to repentance. I will receive you—I have no pleasure in your death—I wish you all, and would welcome you all back again—I want you to be my sons and my daughters, and I will be a Father to you. Oh! my brethren, if after the wrath and justice of God have failed to move your hearts out of the inflexibility which belongs to them, He shall again ply you with His invitations, and your bosoms shall remain in shut and sullen resistance to the tenderness of His touching voice—then to the disobedience of His law you have added the neglect of His salvation; and surely it may be said of those who have not only resisted His authority, but have despised the riches of His forbearance and His long-suffering, that the last arrow has been shot at them, and it has proved ineffectual—and that Gospel which, had they received it, would have been to their soul the savour of life unto life, has turned out the savour of death unto death.'—pp. 273, 274.

The late Dr. Andrew Thomson, of St. George's, Edinburgh, was the most powerful rival of Chalmers; but the former excelled on the platform, the latter in the pulpit. Edinburgh has still its eloquent and popular preachers, but there are none to remind us of the days of Thomson and Chalmers.

Two of the volumes of this series (vii. and viii.) contain the author's *Institutes of Theology*, and they will be regarded as the most valuable and characteristic of the entire series. Admirers of Chalmers, who had studied under him, or had been occasionally in his class-room, we had often heard speak of the eloquence and power of these Academical Lectures, and our high expectations have not been disappointed in their perusal. Ministers of all denominations will now add them to their library, and they will form the most popular of presentation volumes. They form one of the most precious legacies which sanctified genius has ever bequeathed to the Church.

Before proceeding to the 'Subject-matter of Christianity,' the author devotes a few chapters to *Natural Theology* and the *Evidences of Christianity*. In the arrangement of his theological course he followed a different order from that universally pursued by writers on systematic divinity, and, as he attaches much importance to it, we state the difference in his own words:—

'The one proceeds chronologically in the order of the divine administration, beginning with the constitution of the Godhead, and proceeding onward through the successive footsteps of a history which commences with the original purposes of the uncreated mind, and terminates in the consummation of all things. The other proceeds chronologically in the natural order of human inquiry, beginning, therefore, with the darkness and the probabilities, and the wants of Natural Theology, and after having ascertained the Scripture to be a real communication from heaven to earth, seeking first after those announcements that are most directly fitted to relieve the distress and to meet the difficulties of nature. It is thus that in entering upon the record the first thing that would naturally attract the notice is the confirmation which it lends to the apprehensions and the anxieties of nature respecting the fearful extent both of man's depravity and of his danger, whence we should proceed to a consideration of the offered remedy; whence to the means by which that remedy is appropriated; whence to its operation both in reconciling God to man,

Digitized by Google

man, and regenerating man in the likeness of God; whence to the progressive holiness of the life ripening and maturing under the influence of the truths of Christianity, for the exercises and joys of a blissful eternity; whence to death and judgment, and the respective destinies of those who have embraced the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and those who have rejected it. You will perceive that under these two distinct arrangements the topics follow each other in a very different order of succession. We all along were suspicious of the first, though it be the very order of almost all the Confessions and Catechisms of Europe, and of the great majority of our authors, whether in the controversial or the systematic theology. Yet with all these authorities on its side we have ever distrusted the first, and can now say that our entire, our decided preference, is for the second.'—pp. x., xi.

It does not appear to us that much is gained by this new order, and we, on the whole, prefer the old, after carefully reading the author's reasons for the proposed change.

There is a freshness and originality singularly attractive in the three introductory chapters on *Preliminary Ethics*, *Preliminary Metaphysics*, and *Initial Considerations*. His discussion of *Natural Theology* is particularly interesting. The chapters on the *Evidences of Christianity* are exceedingly summary, and, therefore, less satisfactory than if the subject had been examined more in detail; but the public are already acquainted with the author's views on the various topics. Under this head there is a long chapter on *Scripture Criticism*, and, in noticing the work in a Journal of Sacred Literature, it might be expected that prominence should be given to his discussion of this subject; but this chapter is not worthy of the author. Most sincerely do we wish that this discussion had been such as to merit the same unqualified approbation, demanded by the rest of the *Institutes*. The following well-considered remarks deserve the attention of students of divinity:—

'While it is the urgent and indispensable duty of the people to know what the Bible says in our vernacular tongue, it is most desirable that each of you, the future ministers of our land, should know what the Bible says in its original languages. This I hold not only to be a right and respectable accomplishment for all clergymen, but I should regard it as a mutilated church—and that, like an incomplete apparatus, it was bereft or crippled in some of its essential parts, did it not number at least so many of its sons among the first critics and philologists of our age. The Church, viewed as an organic and complicated structure, is wanting in some of its essential members, certain of its important functions are suspended, it fulfils not all the high purposes of its establishment in society—if there be not a goodly number of its ministers profoundly versant, and without the stepping-stone of translations, not merely in the idiomatic phraseology of all the books which enter into the canon of Scripture, but in the ponderous and recondite scholarship of those mighty tomes which, in the shapes of Polyglots, and Prolegomena, and Thesauruses, lie piled in vast and venerable products on the least frequented shelves of our public libraries—standing there, however, in a sort of monumental character, having been bequeathed to us by the gigantic men of other days, as the memorials of an erudition and of an arduous and indefatigable perseverance that are now unknown. I confess that there are few things which I should like better to witness than the revival of this massive, this substantial lore in the Free Church of Scotland.'—vol. vii. p. 279.

The reader of this extract will be surprised when we add that the general tendency of the author's remarks is to discourage the critical study of the Sacred Volume. What other effect could be expected from the following?—'When in search of substantial elements, keep, if you like, by the study of your English Bibles. When in search of curiosities, take the original Scriptures into your hands, and avail your-

Digitized by Google selves

selves of all the light which the Hellenisms, and the Hebraisms, and the Rabbinisms, and all the peculiarities of all the cognate languages can possibly throw upon it' (vol. viii. p. 23). The author seems conscious of the tendency of which we complain, and accordingly he finds it necessary, every now and again, to hint in the way of apology, that for all this he does not discountenance the study. For instance (vol. vii. p. 306), he says, 'It is far, very far from our purpose to depreciate the cause of a sound and thorough philological education for students of divinity;' and yet he contemptuously adds,—'there is a pedantry to which our own country stands at this moment peculiarly exposed, and which really needs to be put down.' It is not easy to see how the *putting down* of this 'pedantry' will promote the study of sacred philology, which, after all, he seems to think of very little consequence to the generality of ministers. It is surely unworthy of the enlightened and liberal mind of Chalmers to discourage the cultivation of a department of study which even he admits to have been too much neglected. This much may be said in the way of extenuation, that he regards as incompatible a high degree of excellence in both the critical and the practical. Page after page we find him weighing the comparative merits of the two, and deciding in favour of the latter. But surely we find these often combined, and they are thus proved to be by no means incompatible. Passing over instances less known, we may mention as a fact which no competent judge will question, that Dr. John Brown, Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church, has displayed in his published works the very highest excellence in both departments. If asked then which we should have, we ask in reply, Why not both? Indeed the combination is necessary to the completeness of either. The Christian minister must not be satisfied with a knowledge of the leading doctrines of the Gospel; he must be able to examine for himself every text of Scripture in the language of inspiration. The people, with few exceptions, must be satisfied with a translation; but the preacher should know the record as God has given it. The mere English reader is liable to many errors, against which the duly qualified expounder of sacred truth will be secured by a glance at the original. The careful expounder of the Divine record possesses a power to arrest the attention and instruct the minds of his hearers, which the mere topical preacher cannot command. It is not his to give a new revelation, but to explain a revelation already given. With the Bible in his hand, it is his duty, like the scribes in the days of Ezra, to give the sense and cause the people to understand the reading (Neh. viii. 8). The intelligent hearer reasonably expects the aid of the pulpit in the interpretation of the more difficult passages of Holy Writ. It is with the utmost propriety that Dr. Brown recommends the student 'to devote a large portion of his attention to the critical study of Scripture;' and adds, 'that no branch of the appointed studies deserves more to be cultivated than this, or has a closer connection with the student becoming fit for answering the great purposes of the Christian ministry.'—(*Hints to Students*, p. 44.)

Dr.

Digitized by Google

Dr. Chalmers recommends certain authors in Scripture Criticism (p. 311), but the list is not adapted to the present state of the science. It is true that the lectures were written nearly twenty years ago, but some parts are revised and adapted, as is evident from allusions to the Free Church—and why not this?

The author seems to attach great importance to the subject of the discussion on which we have animadverted, for he devotes a subsequent chapter to what he calls a 'Recapitulation of our Views on Scripture Criticism' (which he gives under the general head, *Nature of the Gospel Remedy*), and he resumes the subject in his Introductory Lecture as Principal of the New College, Edinburgh, in Nov. 1844; but there is nothing new or different in the last two.

The course of the 'Subject-matter of Christianity' is divided into three parts:—1st. The Disease for which the Gospel Remedy is provided; 2nd. The Nature of the Remedy; and 3rd. The Extent of the Remedy. Six Supplemental Lectures on the Trinity, and kindred topics, are appended. The discussion, as a whole, is admirably conducted. Some of the chapters—for instance the 4th on Part II. —are of great practical power. Several of the lectures are fully as much adapted to the pulpit as the professor's chair. We have often thought that Hill's *Lectures on Divinity* are most adapted to the student, and that Dick's *Lectures on Theology* are most useful to the pastor; and the *Institutes* of Chalmers, though resembling the latter more than the former, have an interest and value so peculiar that the Christian pastor who knows the three would not be willing to be without any one of them. He who earnestly desires to win souls will dwell with much delight and profit on the glowing pages of Chalmers. Instead of the condensed style of Hill, in which we sometimes find a separate argument in every clause, we have here an expansion and breadth of illustration often reminding us of the eloquent orator; yet the reader presses on from page to page under the fascination of a spell. The author's Calvinism must appear harmless, nay, even attractive, to many who have strenuously opposed the repulsive representations of the higher Calvinist. It is refreshing to note the practical turn he gives to the most abstruse speculations.

The author's course is incomplete, but it is supplemented by *Prelections* on Butler, Paley, and Hill, as text books, forming volume ninth of the series. These lectures vary in merit as well as in length. Some of them are long, elaborate, and valuable discussions. On the propriety and advantage of using text-books he makes the following judicious observations:—

'The question is, How shall we make the best and fullest conveyance of the lessons of this science to the students of a theological school? One method is for the professor to describe the whole mighty series of topics in written compositions of his own, and by the delivery of these to acquit himself of his task. . . . Every sentence and every paragraph must be framed by himself; and though on many a given topic of his extended lectureship some gifted reasoner or expounder of former days may have left behind him the standard and the classic model which distances all imitation, and makes superiority hopeless, if not impossible, still the professor is expected to try his own hand upon it, and so to thrust as it were the dim transparency of his own shaded and imperfect lucubrations between the

Digitized by Google

the mind of his disciples and all that purer and more penetrating light which might else have directly beamed upon them from the wisdom and the genius of past ages. . . . . Be assured that there is a better way of ordering this matter, whether for the object of seasoning your minds with the sound and right spirit, or supplying them with the solid informations of theology. Let us take, for an example, Butler's Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion. I might transfer the whole substance and argument of this masterly composition into lectures of my own, and so discharge the main contents of the volume upon you, after they have been made to undergo this elaborate process of distillation. But I speak both the convictions of my reason and the findings of my professional experience when I tell you of a more excellent way—a way by which I am quite sure that I could make a far more effectual lodgement in your understanding of all the principles and philosophy of Butler. I would conduct you immediately to himself: I would bid you draw at once, and with your own hands, from the fountain head; I would have you read, in successive passages, the work; and the course shall be practically carried forward on the strength of these readings and of my examinations.'—pp. x.-xii.

The question is not whether these examinations, or original lectures, shall compose the course—though even in this case some (unwisely we think) would prefer the former alternative; but it is, whether lectures alone, or accompanied by readings, shall be preferred? And here, we think, there is great wisdom in the choice of Chalmers.

The strictures on Butler, Paley, and Hill appear to us, on the whole, just, and they afford valuable aid to the student in his examination of these authors; they also serve to stimulate the exercise of an independent judgment in studying the works of the most approved authors.

The volume is concluded by four addresses, delivered by the author as principal of the New College, Edinburgh. Thus has been finished a most important series of posthumous works, well deserving the popularity they enjoy.

Critical History and Defence of the Old Testament Canon. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sac. Literature in the Theol. Seminary, Andover, Mass. With an Introduction and Notes by Samuel Davidson, D.D., of the University of Halle. London: George Routledge and Co.: 1849.

There are some works which are peculiarly opportune. As such we must designate the volume before us—a volume which deserves, and which we confidently trust will obtain, a wide circulation in this country.

The circumstance which led Professor Stuart to take up the subject was the appearance of Mr. Norton's dissertation against the Old Testament, subjoined to his work entitled 'The Genuineness of the Gospels.' We may be allowed here to remark that almost any other name would have suited Mr. Norton's work as well as that which he has adopted; for, although he does show that the evidence is absolute on the subject of the genuineness of the Gospels, yet he takes the occasion to cover with this attractive title all his own sentiments on the subject of Christianity and religion. It might be more fitly called 'An Inquiry how much of Scripture is inconsistent with a belief in the

Digitized by Google

the Trinity, the Godhead of Christ, the Atonement, etc.' This would really describe the book: it is a work which shows *painfully* how the writer is capable of apprehending the force of objective evidence, and yet rejects it whenever it clashes with his own subjective feelings. He always puts forward *his idea* of God, instead of learning what God has revealed *of Himself*: and whatever is inconsistent with his idea of what is suitable with regard to God is forthwith rejected.

Man has to learn an humbling lesson: God is greater than man; God's thoughts are not as man's thoughts. If God had waited till man *asked* Him to send His eternal Son, that He might become incarnate, *and die* for our salvation, where should we have been?

This is the ground on which Mr. Norton rejects the Old Testament as an authoritative collection of inspired books. The continual mention of sacrifices pointing onward to the one sacrifice of Christ; the whole aspect of the Mosaic economy; the revelation of God as a hater of sin, does not suit his creed: he, therefore, seeks to argue against the authority of the Mosaic and other writings, and to *assert* that various commandments *could not* have proceeded from God. And yet some of these very precepts are those which *especially* are filled with spiritual significance, and are unfolded to us in the New Testament. It is a sad thing, when God has vouchsafed His own explanation, that any should turn away and prefer holding fast their own preconceived ideas.

Mr. Norton may say that it is 'a melancholy fact' that the command to make the tabernacle, etc., has 'been regarded as a Divine communication:' we say, on the contrary, that the melancholy part of the fact is that any one should reject the spiritual significance of all that was so commanded, and can seem to overlook that the fact which he laments is fully sustained by the New Testament. But when we say that Mr. Norton would fain persuade us that Tertullian did not believe in the *actual* Godhead of Christ, our readers will, we think, be inclined to believe that he presents *assertions* in the place of *proofs*.

Mr. Norton's note 'on the Old Testament' has called Professor Stuart's work into existence: and now that 'The Genuineness of the Gospels' has been reprinted in this country, an edition of Professor Stuart's volume has likewise appeared amongst us, edited by Dr. Davidson. We are thankful that the sophistry of the American opponent of the Old Testament was met in his own country; we are thankful that the endeavour to diffuse the poison on this side the Atlantic has been similarly counteracted. And something was needful amongst us, for (as Dr. Davidson shows in his Preface) works appear under specious titles which take quite as insidiously antagonistic a ground as that of Mr. Norton.

The important questions with regard to the Old Testament canon are thus stated by the English Editor:—

'*First.* By what principle or principles were certain writings regarded as sacred and authoritative by the Jewish nation at large, while others were looked on as of mere human origin? *Secondly.* Are Christians bound to follow the Jews in this respect, and so to regard the same writings as Divine? *Thirdly.* When and by whom

Digitized by Google

whom was the canon closed? *Fourthly.* Were any changes made at any time in the books, either in the way of addition or of rectifying errors which had crept in from the time they were first written?'—p. v.

Dr. Davidson afterwards says:—

'The reader of the following treatise will perceive that it throws considerable light on the *first two* questions. On the *last two*, especially on the fourth, little is advanced. The work, indeed, is rather *an apology* for the present canon, than a full and impartial history of it.'—p. vi.

Now, we think, that if the *first two* questions be really answered, an important work is done: even if the strain be *apologetic*, we do not object: this was the very object of the author. If sufficient proof be given of the canonical authority of any book or collection of books, we can hold fast this *fact* in spite of difficulties. Indeed, if we wait till all *difficulties* be explained, we shall never make any advance in truth, whether natural or revealed. There may be many things in a Biblical book of which we have to own the difficulty: we are not driven to own that the difficulty cannot be explained, but only to confess *our* incompetence to do so.

If, then, we possess good evidence that a book forms a part of those 'oracles of God' which He intrusted to His ancient people Israel, we may rest assured that we do rightly to hold it fast, wholly irrespective of *our* ability to meet the difficulties which are raised, or even of *our* apprehension of its specific use. Until our minds are capable of fathoming the Divine mind, we must not, apart from His known revelation, profess any competence to say what is or is not worthy of having been inspired by His Spirit.

Professor Stuart has principally to do with absolute external testimony to the canon of the Old Testament. The other subjects, such as the particular objections raised against individual books, come before us rather incidentally than otherwise. In such parts it is well to bear in mind that the author regards the external testimony as sufficient; and *then* he proceeds, not to cope with the objector, but to meet the feelings of any to whom the external testimony has been presented in its sufficiency, but who may yet feel some difficulty resting on their minds: he here is not dealing with opposing unbelief, but with tried and perplexed belief. He deals in this part (he says) with one whose 'head was rather in fault than his heart (if, indeed, it be in fault), and I should feel it my duty rather to labour to enlighten his mind, than to reprove the state of his feelings' (p. 328).

One of the books to which he then refers (at some length) is the Canticles. He makes some allusion to the manner in which some moderns have treated it: amongst others, he mentions Ewald. Such writers have probably helped not a little in leading some minds to reject the inspiration of that book. Indeed, if Ewald's exposition were received, it will be difficult to imagine that it *could* be divine. Professor Stuart gives a *very gentle* statement of Ewald's exposition. The upshot of the book is (according to Ewald), that a country maiden, whom king Solomon has vainly wooed, is at last united to a rustic bridegroom, and then they together *deride* king Solomon.

It is not to be supposed that *all* Stuart's views will meet with general

Digitized by Google

general acceptance. Some of his views of Scripture may be peculiar to himself; but even those who most differ from him *ought* thankfully to accept his labours, and to rejoice that, with all the pressure of years, he has thus vigorously stood forward as a defender of the truth.

Dr. Davidson, the editor, has added a few notes: we could gladly have welcomed more from his pen. The following is a specimen: it is appended to a passage in which Professor Stuart had spoken of the tenor of the histories in the Old Testament.

'Most instructive is it to compare the biographies written by moderns with those contained in the Old Testament. If a man be distinguished for great abilities that are mainly directed towards the good of his country, he is *extravagantly* praised as a hero, and his crimes palliated or omitted. He is held up to admiration as a marvellous hero *throughout*. Of this we have a notable example in D'Aubigné's vindication of Oliver Cromwell—to say nothing of Carlyle's extravagant, undiscriminating eulogies. When a religious author and historian can say, as D'Aubigné does, of the Protector's conduct in Ireland—"Should he employ a few weeks with the sacrifice of 5000 men, or several years with the loss of perhaps 20,000? Having weighed everything, he decided for the hand of iron. That hand is never amiable, but yet there are cases in which it is salutary." In further apologising for cruel butcheries perpetrated by the hero, the historian says that Cromwell "followed the most skilful course to arrive at a prompt and universal pacification." So, then, it is right to do evil, that good may come. It is *the most skilful course* to massacre thousands of human beings in order to arrive at a prompt pacification. It is high time that such one-sided biographies be eschewed.'—p. 332.

With these remarks we cordially coincide.

In page 54, Professor Stuart, after giving some curious instances of mistakes which persons of discernment have made as to writings professedly ancient, refers to the inscription *said* to have been found in Cyrenaica, which imposed on Gesenius and others. He does not, however, give the facts quite accurately. This Phœnician inscription professed an extreme antiquity; Gesenius, however, thought it to be a forgery, but not executed in modern times. He believed the testimony of the Frenchman who transmitted it to Paris: he thought that it was forged by some Carpocratensian heretic, as if to give an ancient sanction to their doctrines. He suggests the possibility of its having been a recent forgery: but he rejects the thought because he considered the French Marquis who produced it to be worthy of credit. Thus the discovery that the whole was a modern deception does not detract from Gesenius's critical character; and he is not deserving of the derision with which Hengstenberg and others have treated him. This illustration really tells the other way.

The following is the concluding sentence of Professor Stuart's last section:—

'I hope it will not be deemed a matter of reproach to me that I have thought it important for defence to find out, if possible, whence the armour of our assailants comes, and to meet them, if it may be, with arms adapted to new times and new methods of attack. I am, indeed, slow to believe that we of the present day are bound to keep ourselves ignorant of the strength and resources of our assailants. The contest has truly become one, as I have said, PRO ARIS ET FOCIS. The question whether Christianity is to be the predominant religion of this country, or to yield to philosophic infidelity, is soon to be settled. Bowed down, in some measure, under the weight of years, and tottering under the long-continued pressure of bodily infirmities, I have still, perhaps most rashly, thrown myself into the arena of contest; and there I mean to remain, so long as I can wield a weapon, however light, or

Digitized by Google

or lift up a prayer to the great Head of the Church for the success of His cause. The standard under which I have enlisted waves aloft over the battle-ground, and bears the inscription, in characters of light, "CHRIST AND THE CHURCH; THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE OLD." I hope and trust in God that I shall never—never desert it.'—p. 394.

Such was the object of the author—such the spirit in which his book was written.

The Bible of Every Land. Parts 6 and 7 (a double Part). Bagster and Sons.

This portion of this interesting and useful work contains two branches of the great Indo-European Class of Languages: the Celtic and the Teutonic families. The Ethnographical Map is that of Europe, coloured according to the *families* of languages; it thus contains much which belongs to future parts of the work.

A mere inspection of the map shows the very different extent of the two families of language of which this part treats. The Celtic occupies but the narrow limits of Wales, the north of Scotland, great part of Ireland, the Isle of Man, and Bas Bretagne; while the Teutonic, besides its being the tongue of all the other parts of the British isles, extends from Iceland to the Drave, from the Meuse to the Vistula. Besides this wide extent, we must also remember how the English tongue has found itself a home in the United States of North America, and in the English colonies from Hudson's Bay to New Zealand.

The Celtic family of languages exhibit to us an ancient race confined within more and more narrow limits, the Teutonic a prolific family increasing and extending, replete with life.

Even in the remembrance of men yet living, one Celtic tongue—the Cornish—has sunk into *entire* disuse, so that it is a language (though easy of acquirement to any one who really understands Welsh) to be learned as a dead tongue. In ancient times, the Celtic forms of speech extended widely; Britain, Gaul, and other countries were wholly Celtic, where now Teutonic languages or those formed from the Latin prevail. Perhaps the most remarkable proof of the extent of Celtic dialects is found in the Celtic elements contained in the Latin language. We are not going to enter into any long philological inquiry, nor yet to indulge in some of those *dreams* with which Welsh antiquaries have amused themselves and their readers,—not being Welsh (although acquainted with that copious and expressive tongue), we are perhaps pretty free from this temptation; but we shall content ourselves with stating a fact or two in proof that the Latin received some of its contributions from Celtic sources at a time when the languages of this latter class had made no small progress in their artificial formation of words. Thus the Latin word *garrulus* presents a considerable resemblance to the Welsh *geiriolus* (of similar meaning). Did the Welsh borrow from the Latins, or vice versâ? The word *geiriolus* is a regular derivative from *gair, a word;* the formative steps stand thus: *gair, geiriawl, geiriolus;* the primitive in this case is purely Celtic. Again, the Welsh *daionus* is closely related to *bonus*, originally

Digitized by Google

ally *duonus*: the Celtic adjective springs by several descents from *da*, good: *da, daiawn, daioni* (goodness), *daionus*, possessed of the quality of goodness.

Strange then have been the vicissitudes of the Celtic tongues in times past. Many opinions might be hazarded as to their probable extinction. We can only say that the Welsh does not exhibit present symptoms of sharing the fate of its Cornish sister-dialect; for in Wales there is that literary spirit at work which is the best safeguard to the security of a language. It is hardly more than thirty years when the Rev. Joseph Harris, Baptist Minister of Swansea, commenced a monthly periodical; others have since sprung into existence, so that at this moment there are probably eight or ten such periodicals almost entirely kept up both as to writers and readers by *the people*; and of all these publications *not one* has a sceptical or immoral tendency.

In connection with THE BIBLE, the Welsh has a peculiar interest; for it was in order to supply the wants of Wales that the British and Foreign Bible Society arose into existence; its origin may be ascribed to three men, all of Welsh race and names,—the Rev. Thomas Jones of Creaton, the Rev. Joseph Hughes, and especially the Rev. Thomas Charles of Bala. In this number of "The Bible of Every Land," the Welsh versions are given first; of these there are three specimens,—that of William Salisbury, of Bishop Morgan, and Bishop Parry, all taken from the rare original editions. Then follow the other Celtic tongues, Gaelic, Irish, Manks, and Breton;—all except the last belonging to the British Isles.

The Teutonic family commences with the GOTHIC of Ulphilas (recently noticed in the JOURNAL); then come the extinct Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon; and the versions of most interest to us—the English. Of our early versions there are several specimens given: Wiclif, Tyndall, Coverdale, Matthew, Cranmer, Taverner, Geneva, Bishops, Rheims. Of the latter there is also a specimen taken from a recent edition of the Douay Bible. It is curious to observe the *differences* between the two. In many points the version has been altered from the translation in common use. In speaking of the editions published by Tyndall, we are told that the chronological order stands thus:—"1524. The Gospels of Matthew and Mark." "1525. The New Testament of Tyndall's version." This is the edition of which the late Mr. Rodd, the bookseller, discovered a fragment, now in the British Museum. Then is mentioned the New Testament of 1526; "until recently this has been generally believed to have been the first edition of Tyndall's version;" we do not wonder that this should have been supposed; *for the address at the end says that such is the case.* Sir Thomas More also says that the notes, etc. (as found in Mr. Rodd's fragment) were added *after.*

The other Teutonic languages present interesting materials for examination. We have before us the Flemish, Dutch, old High German, German (several specimens), Icelandic, Danish, Swedish, and Faroese.

It is expected that the whole work will be completed in about five more parts.

Quæstionem

Digitized by Google

Quæstionem de Marcione Lucani Evangelii, ut fertur, adulteratore, collatis Hahnii, Ritschelii, aliorumque sententiis, novo examini submisit D. HARTING, Theol. Dr. Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1849. 8vo. pp. 211.

'Pertness and ignorance may ask a question in three lines, which it will cost learning and ingenuity thirty pages to answer; and when this is done, the same question shall be triumphantly asked again the next year, as if nothing had ever been written on the subject.' Such was the *dictum* of Bishop Horne; and the experience of the sixty years which have passed since his time only confirms the wisdom with which he uttered it.

We might ask that some points at least might be considered as *proved;* that some attested facts should be considered as incontrovertible; but *no.* Destructive criticism will allow nothing to be unquestionable which rests upon evidence, nothing to be certain except its own decisions, which rest on the most overweening self-conceit, and not on evidence at all.

We ask the rejecters of evidence one thing. Do be consistent and disbelieve every thing which you have not subjected to the test of your own senses; reject as foolish credulity all belief in foreign countries which you have never visited; and as you are so inclined to deny that there is a hereafter (at least of personal consciousness), reject as an idle figment that there was any *past,* prior to the time when you yourselves came into existence, each the centre (and perhaps the entirety) of his own sphere of things.*

Dr. Harting's book was originally written as a thesis to be defended for his degree of Doctor in Theology. For this purpose, however, it was not needed, as the University of Utrecht conferred this honour spontaneously. But there were sufficient reasons why the volume should be given to the public, even though it had not been required for the occasion intended. The author had taken up the important question whether Marcion really did mutilate St. Luke's Gospel or not,—whether the testimony of the Fathers who assert this is or is not worthy of credit.

Formerly there was no doubt felt or expressed on the subject; the clear statements of Tertullian and others were believed, as carrying with them a sufficient historic weight. Doubts were expressed whether Marcion were himself the mutilator, or whether he did not really use some other *recension* of St. Luke's Gospel than that which we have; inquiries were raised whether some of the alterations pointed out were after all more than 'various readings.'

The subject was at length taken up by Hahn and Olshausen, whose labours showed most satisfactorily that the old opinions based on evidence were quite true; that the evidence would bear a searching examination, and that the result was consistent with itself.

* ''Twas for my accommodation
Nature rose when I was born;
Should I die, the whole creation
Back to nothing would return.'

It

Digitized by Google

It might then have been thought that the question was settled, and the claims of Marcion's Evangelium well understood. Marcion, the *professed* upholder of *Pauline* doctrine, was shown to have formed a system into which Christian truths and doctrines were admitted so far as Marcion pleased and no farther. The Lord Jesus Christ was not acknowledged to be *really man*, and the Old Testament was wholly rejected. Everything, therefore, which Marcion noticed in St. Luke's Gospel which bore on the incarnation of the Son of God, or which upheld the Old Testament, was ruthlessly cut away; and this mutilated book was the only Gospel which he owned as possessed of *authority*. Some of late have maintained that Marcion was actuated by a *pious feeling* in his holding that Christ was God, but not man. At least this was not *Christian* piety; for had not He who was eternally *God* and the Son of God, become *man*, where would redemption and deliverance through His precious blood have been? and what would our condition have been, if we had not Him who has died and risen again, as the object of our faith?

The Tübingen school, of course, have not let Marcion alone; in their attack on all absolute, objective, historic truth, they again oppose all the *proved facts* with regard to Marcion and his Gospel. If these facts were admitted, they would destroy all the theories of that school; for then it would follow that St. Luke's Gospel existed *before* it was mutilated; and if so, it must have belonged to the Apostolic age (which they boldly deny)!

Dr. Harting has come forward in this state of things: he proposes the questions at issue; he examines again the ancient testimonies; he compares Marcion's Gospel with St. Luke's; he considers the *modern* grounds on which the charges against Marcion have been treated as untrue; he examines the *assertions* that Marcion's Gospel was the basis of St. Luke's; and all the points being considered, he draws his conclusion—'that there is no reason for rejecting the opinion, held from the most ancient times by all, that Marcion adulterated the canonical text of Luke that he found, and that he interpolated it in various manners.'

This conclusion may be safely maintained; and unless arguments different from the Tübingen sophistries are brought forward, it will not really be impugned; by fair argument it cannot be controverted, for it is an historic fact. It is a pity that learned men should be so often compelled to do that of which Bishop Horne complained; but unless foolish objections can be safely allowed to perish in their own obscurity, it is well for them to be met and refuted. The task is wearisome, though often useful.

The Jewish Missionary. A New and Literal Interpretation of the Visions of Daniel . . . . and other Prophecies with reference to the Restoration of the Jews, and the Reign of the Idol Messiah. London. Nisbet and Co.

This is a re-publication, with alterations and additions, of a series of papers that appeared some time since in *The Voice of Israel*, under the signature

Digitized by Google

signature of 'Pergamos.' We remember to have read them at the time with curiosity and interest. The work, in its present shape, contains much remarkable and more strange matter; and the views set forth will doubtless engage the attention of all the students of Apocalyptic literature. The number of such students seems increasing; for fully a third of all the books that reach us bear more or less upon this class of subjects. Among the writers of these books, the present author is one of the most ingenious and original. He has produced a book which will be interesting to many, if only for the facts and illustrations which the author pours forth with no sparing hand in support of the views he has adopted. The term 'Idol Messiah' in the title will startle many readers. In explanation, we may intimate that the author understands that the famous passage in Dan. ix. 24–27, which has been commonly understood to refer to and have been fulfilled at the coming of our Lord, is regarded as of yet future fulfilment. The prince Messiah, in this passage, is regarded as representing, not, as usually supposed, the Lord Jesus, but a false Messiah, or anti-Christ, the little horn of the preceding visions, who is to reign with a high hand, and whom the Jews are to recognise as their Messiah. He is that 'man of sin' whom the Apostle speaks of as to be revealed before the day of the Lord (2 Thess. ii. 3).

The 'Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth,' whose sudden and terrible downfall is foretold in Revelations xvii. and xviii., is generally supposed by Protestant writers to be no other than Rome; but the author of this work thinks differently. It is, in his view, Constantinople. He regards the general object of the book of Revelation as

'a prophetical history of the events connected with the future national restoration of Israel; and at that restoration their national character will be just what it now is, Rabbinical or Talmudical. Now since Palestine is in the hands of Turkey, the re-establishment of Israel will be in that country, either with the consent of Turkey, or by the overthrow of the Turkish power. But not to insist on the improbability that Turkey will ever consent to the dismemberment of her empire, all the prophecies of the later times forewarn us that these times will be distinguished by wars, and commotions, and troubles so fearful and grievous, that the whole history of the world cannot produce a parallel to them: the event therefore to which we must look forward, as immediately connected with the national restoration of Israel, is the entire subversion of the empire of Turkey; and the same overthrow of Turkey which gives the Jews possession of Palestine, will make them lords of the city of Constantinople; and Constantinople, under the government of the Babylonian Talmud, will be Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.'

The author argues this point at some length; but he will scarcely, we apprehend, gain many converts to this opinion; and the one to which we previously referred will find some opponents. The exuberant mental activity of the writer renders him prolific of striking suggestions, many of which deserve consideration; and some, which at the first view one is inclined at once to reject, will appear on the second to present fair claims to attention. The clue to his views is to be found in the fact that he regards the key to the right understanding of the book of Revelation to be found in the customs of the modern Rabbinical Jews; and

Digitized by Google

and an interpretation of its principal matter, founded upon that principle, has necessarily a degree of freshness and originality not often to be found at this time in works upon the Apocalyptic interpretation.

A great point with the writer is that Daniel's fourth empire, usually understood of the Romans, does not yet exist. He calls it Pergamos, and actually assigns to it the locality of that ancient city, in the belief, as we understand, that it is indicated as such in the Apocalyptic message which mentions it as the place 'where Satan's seat is—where Satan dwelleth.' Pergamos, then, is to be the seat of the new empire; but 'at what moment the Dragon will rise up and make the acropolis of Pergamos the stepping-stone of his greatness we know not.'

BIBLICAL INTELLIGENCE.

Messrs. Longmans announce the commencement in monthly parts of a work by the Rev. W. J. Conybeare and the Rev. J. S. Howson, on the *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, to be illustrated with plates, wood engravings, maps, charts, coins, &c. It is to include a translation of the Epistles, to be inserted in chronological order. The work is to form two volumes. This seems to us one of the most promising undertakings of the season. Indeed we have not seen much else in Sacred Literature that requires notice.

We have recently observed in the papers the death of Monsignor Laureani, at the age of 76, primo custode of the Vatican, well known, from the situation which he there held, to Biblical and other students.

The third volume of Professor Torrey's translation of Neander's *Church History* has been published in the United States. This completes the eighth part of the entire work, and embraces the history from A.D. 590 to A.D. 1073. Mr. Clark of Edinburgh reprints this American translation in his Foreign Library, two of his volumes embracing the contents of one of the original.

We have seen the announcement of a work by Dr. John Brown on our Lord's Discourses. We shall perhaps owe this to the encouragement the author derives from the well-deserved favour with which his Expository Discourses on the First Epistle of Peter has been received. This valuable work has already reached a second edition, although we have reason to think that it is much less known south of the Tweed than it ought to be, or than, as a standard work of its class, it is sure eventually to become.

We have lately received the fourth number of the Journal of the American Oriental Society, of which Professor Robinson is President. Too large a proportion of it is perhaps devoted to African dialects. Among the remaining papers there is a translation from the *Turkish* of Et-Tabary's Conquest of Persia by the Arabs, a translation of the Imperial Berât issued by Sultan Selim III., A.H. 1215, appointing the monk Hohannes Patriarch of all the Armenians in Turkey. It is illustrated with notes by the translator, the Rev. H. J. O. Dwight of Constantinople. On the Identification of the Signs of the Persian Cuneiform Alphabet, an able paper, by the Secretary of the Society, Mr. Salisbury; and, what is to us the most interesting and valuable paper in the number, a report on the Present Condition of the Medical Profession in Syria, by the American Medical Missionary, the Rev. C. V. A. Van Dyck, M.D. This is really a most valuable contribution to our knowledge of Syria, and it is our purpose to enrich the next number of the Journal with some extracts from it.

Scarcely

Digitized by Google

Scarcely less than a score of languages have within the last thirty years been reduced to writing by the American missionaries engaged in foreign missions—for the most part of a uniform system of orthography.

Such of the last issue of American quarterly theological periodicals as we have received, is rather above the average rate of ability and interest.

The *Bibliotheca Sacra* is excellent, but less various even than usual. The first paper is on Natural Theology; the second discusses the meaning of Irenæus in his phrase 'Regenerated unto God;' the third examines the Relations of Faith and Philosophy; another is on the Internal and External element of Religion, and the last is a Translation of the 13th and 14th chapters of Isaiah, with explanatory notes by Professor Edwards. There are, besides, articles on Benson's Egypt, and on the Galla Language.

The *Biblical Repository* is a good number. It commences with an article by Dr. Beecher on the Life and Times of Leo the Great; then follow—the Province of Philosophy in the Interpretation of Scripture; the Doctrine of Man's Immortality and of the Eternal Punishment of the Wicked as set forth in the Ancient Scriptures; the Gospel of St. John, indicating the state of Christian Sentiment in his Times; the Demand and Demonstration of a Future Retribution in Natural Theology; the Contribution of Intellect to Religion; the Doctrine of the Trinity Rational and Scriptural; and the Law and the Gospel. If the *Repository* goes on as in this number, it will not be long in recovering its elder reputation.

Lord's *Theological and Literary Journal* pursues its own peculiar and limited path. It has a long article on Dr. Bushnell's Discourses, which have attracted much attention in the United States: then follow a Designation of the Figures in Isaiah; the Restoration of the Israelites; and the Principal Predicted Events that are to precede Christ's coming.

The *Methodist Quarterly Review* has, among other articles, one on the Preparation for Christianity in the History of the World a proof of its Divine Origin; an article on Dr. Chalmers; one on the Philosophical Study of Languages, and others on Layard's Nineveh, and on the Expedition to the Dead Sea.

We omitted to record in our last Number the death of a very remarkable man—one of the greatest of Continental scholars, but also the greatest doubter of his time—Dr. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette. He died at midsummer, 1849, in his 70th year. He had but lately given to the public the last volume of his *Exegetical Manual Commentary on the New Testament*, from the preface to which it is most satisfactory to learn that a change had in the course of time passed over his mind, and that, although still far from orthodox, he was no longer the reckless rationalist of former years. His words—we may almost call them his last words—are these: 'I am permitted to finish this part of the Exegetical Manual, and with it the work begun thirty years ago. The last labour on the book has been the hardest. I began this part amid the preparations for civil war in Switzerland; I carried it on undisturbed while the throne of France was falling, and those of Germany tottered; I have finished it under the dark thunder-clouds of anarchy which are lowering over the nations and kingdoms of Europe. I thank God for the peace of mind he has granted me; yet anxiety for our fate and for that of the Church has accompanied every stroke of my pen. I could not help seeing the Antichrist of the Apocalypse in our day, though with changed and even more fearful characters. The self-deification of the Romish Church appears to me as child's play compared with that arrogant and atheistic *Egoismus* which spurns all restraint; and what were persecution with fire and sword in comparison with the modern unbelieving *love of freedom*, with all its infatuations and its blandishments—freedom so called, yet springing from the veriest slavery, and leading the poor nations to the direst bondage both of soul and body?.... This I know, that salvation can be found in no other name but the name of Jesus Christ the Crucified; that there is nothing higher for mankind than the Divine Humanity realized in Him, and the kingdom of God planted by Him..... Had Christ been our hope in deed and in truth, how could such an apostacy have occurred? Our Christianity must become life and deed. How long before we shall escape from the confined and narrow circle of the abstract

Digitized by Google

abstract understanding and the enervating sentiment? More than seven, and again seven plagues, may be necessary to teach us where true salvation is to be sought.'

The Rev. H. G. O. Dwight, the American Missionary at Constantinople, has transmitted to the American Oriental Society a catalogue of all the works or portions of works of the early Fathers now existing in the Armenian language, in the order of their antiquity, with preliminary observations on the value of the Christian literature of the Armenians, with reference to the understanding of the Christian Fathers, and the decision of the question what really came from their hands and what is apocryphal.

We learn with satisfaction that one of our contributors, John von Gumpach, Esq., of Malines, has received a gold medal of Merit from the King of Prussia for his work on the Ancient Hebrew Calendars (*Ueber den Altenjüdischen Kalender*), which we mentioned on its first appearance, and had hoped ere this to have introduced more fully to the reader's notice. Kings are seldom faster than reviewers.

UNITED STATES.—We have, at the last moment before going to press, received by letter from Professor B. B. Edwards, of Andover, the subjoined information:—

'Professor Stuart is again able to resume his pen. He has prepared an extended and able article on the first verses in St. John's Gospel, which will be published in the January Number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

'Professor Hackett's *Commentary on the Acts* is nearly ready for the press. We confidently expect a very able and satisfactory exposition of this book from his pen. He has several times gone over it in his class in the Newton Theological Institution.

'Dr. Robinson's *New Testament Lexicon*, it is understood, is ready for the press. We hope to see it in the course of next spring.

'It is proposed by Prof. Hackett of Newton and Prof. Edwards of Andover to prepare a *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, in one 8vo. vol., to be published, God willing, in the autumn of 1850.

'The *Commentary of Hengstenberg* (in the new edition, the first vol. of which has just appeared) will be in some sense the basis. The substance and marrow of his protracted comments will be made use of, in connection with all the grammatical references and philological notes which the student of the Psalms may need. It is hoped that the excellences of Hengstenberg's exposition may be combined with an ampler philological apparatus, fitting it, by the aid of the latest investigations, for those who are studying the Psalter in the original, and also for those who would enjoy the practical and devotional observations of Hengstenberg. The notes of other writers, e.g. Von Lengerke and Vaihingh, will be made use of when thought desirable. The price of the English translation, in three large vols., puts it out of the power of many in this country to purchase, who would be very glad to own it.

'*The Christian Ethics* of Dr. Harless, of Leipsic, will soon be published in Philadelphia. The translator is the Rev. J. H. Hoffmann.

'The Works of Bishop England of Charlestown, S.C., perhaps the ablest Roman Catholic divine who has lived in this country, have been collected and published in five 8vo. vols., by his successor, Bishop Reynolds. They are said to be miscellaneous in their contents, and not without attraction to the Protestant reader.

'It is reported that the Rev. Albert Barnes has a *Commentary on the Apocalypse* in preparation.

'It is the Rev. James W. Alexander who has succeeded Dr. Miller as Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Princeton. He is an elder brother of Dr. J. A. Alexander, the commentator on Isaiah. They are sons of the venerable Dr. Archibald Alexander.'—See *Journ. of Sac. Lit.*, Oct., p. 414.

LIST

Digitized by Google

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

ENGLISH.

Everett (J.)—Adam Clarke Portrayed. Vol. 3, 12mo. pp. 504.

Morison (James)—An Exposition of the Ninth Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans. 8vo. pp. 582. (Kilmarnock.)

Strickland (W. P.)—History of the American Bible Society, from its Organization to the present Time. Royal 8vo. pp. 490. (New York.)

Macpherson (Rev. A.)—Lectures on the Book of Jonah. By the Rev. Alexander Macpherson, A.B. 18mo. pp. 158. (Edinburgh.)

Saintes (A.)—A Critical History of Rationalism in Germany, from its Origin to the present Time. By Amand Saintes. 8vo. pp. 392.

Alford (Rev. H.) The Greek Testament, with a critically revised Text, a Digest of various Readings, Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage, Prolegomena, and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. In 2 vols. Vol. I. containing the Four Gospels. 8vo. pp. 760.

Cozens (S.)—A Biblical Lexicon of Two Thousand Five Hundred Names of Men and Places in the Bible, &c. &c. 12mo. pp. 180.

Cumming (J.)—God in History; or, Facts illustrative of the Presence and Providence of God in the Affairs of Men. By the Rev. John Cumming. 12mo. pp. 156.

Houghton (W.)—An Examination of Calvinism, and especially of its Present Modified Forms, by the Test of Holy Scripture. 2nd edit. 12mo. pp. 196.

Wood (P.)—A Treatise on an Original and Complete System of Theology, founded on the Attributes of the Lord Jehovah. By Philip Wood. 8vo. pp. 342.

Elliot (H. M.)—Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Muhammedan. Vol. I. General Histories, 8vo. pp. 518. (Calcutta.)

Muhleisen (Rev. J.)—Genuine and Spurious Religion: a Compendious, Scriptural, and Consecutive View of the Origin, Development, and Character of Different Systems of Belief. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 783.

Smith (G.)—Sacred Annals, or Researches into the History and Religion of Mankind. Vol II. The Hebrew People, 2 Parts. Post 8vo. pp. 782.

Williams (Rev. I.)—The Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Ministry Harmonized. Part III. with Reflections. 12mo. pp. 496.

Chalmers (T.)—Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers. By his Son-in-Law, the Rev. William Hanna. Vol. I. 8vo. pp. 520.

History of the Inquisition, from its Establishment to the present Time: with an Account of its Procedure, and Narratives of its Victims. 12mo. pp. 458.

Moody (C.)—The New Testament Expounded and Illustrated according to the usual Marginal References in the very Words of Holy Scripture. Together with the Notes and Translations, and a complete Marginal Harmony of the Gospels. Part I. pp. 350.

Digitized by Google

Sartorius (E.)—The Person and Work of Christ. Translated by the Rev. Oakman S. Stearns, A.M. 18mo. pp. 162. (Boston, U.S.)

Seventh (The) General Council, the Second of Nicæa: with copious Notes from the "Caroline Books." Translated from the Original by the Rev. John Mendham, M.A. 8vo. pp. 582.

Vaughan (R.)—Letter and Spirit: a Discourse on Modern Philosophical Spiritualism in its relation to Christianity. 12mo. pp. 94.

Wrighte (T. W.)—Considerations on the Sacred History of the Old World. By the Rev. Thomas W. Wrighte, A.M. 8vo. pp. 168. (Faversham.)

FOREIGN.

Drechsler (M.)—Der Prophet Jesaja. Uebersetzst u. erklärt. Vol. II. Part I. 8vo. (Stuttg.)

Hagenbach (K. R.)—Die Kirchengeschichte d. 18. u. 19. Jahrhunderts. 2 vols. 8vo. (Leipz.)

Harting (D.)—Quaestionem de Marcione, Lucani evangelii, ut fertur, adulteratore, collatis Hahnii, Ritschelii aliorumque sententiis, novo examini submisit. 8vo. (Traj.)

Neander (A.)—Antignosticus, Geist des Tertullianus u. Einleitung in dessen Schriften. 8vo. (Berlin.)

Biblia hebraica ad optimas editiones imprimis Van der Hooght accurate recensa et expressa. Curavit argumentique notat. ind. et clavem masoreth. add. C. G. G. Theile. Editio ster. 8vo. (Lips.)

Caspari (C. P.) über den syrisch-ephraimitischen Krieg unter Jotham u. Ahas. 8vo. (Christ.)

Movers (F. C.)—Die Phönizier. Vol. II. Part I.: Das phönizische Alterthum. Vol. I., Politische Geschichte u. Staatsverfassung. 8vo. (Berlin.)

Digitized by Google

THE

JOURNAL

OF

SACRED LITERATURE.

No. X.—APRIL, 1850.

THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

S. Justini Philosophi et Martyris Opera. Recensuit, Prolegomenis, Adnotatione ac Versione instruxit Indicesque adjecit Joann. Carol. Theod. Otto Jenensis, Philosophiæ doctor, Theologiæ candidatus, Societatis Latinæ Jenensis et Historico Theologicæ Lipsiensis sodalis ordinarius. Præfatus est L. F. O. Baumgarten-Crusius, Professor Jenensis. 8vo. Jenæ. 1842.

Many places on the habitable parts of our world owe their celebrity more frequently to the great names which have been associated with them by circumstances, or the events that have occurred in their vicinity, than to extraordinary natural features or peculiar geographical position. Thus Marathon is only a barren and repulsive plain, but Grecian heroism has made it a memory, and poetry has transformed it into music. Stratford-upon-Avon, too, will win its thousands of pilgrims as the birth-place of the master spirit of English song, whom its own commonplace tameness would never attract. And to speak of One beside whose name no other can be breathed—One 'fairer than the sons of men'—Bethlehem, the place where the genethliacal star shone, Nazareth, where His 'gracious words' awoke the wonder of the synagogue, and Sychar, where being weary 'He sate thus upon the well;' where too He held that divine discourse unheard before of catholicity and spirituality, 'neither here nor yet in Jerusalem,' 'God is a Spirit'—these have

Digitized by Google

obtained

obtained a celebrity though obscure, a dignity though mean, a power though weak, before which all other claims to reputation fail. To indulge ourselves, however, with only one more observation upon the last named, and then pass on to the work we have in hand, which is rather with persons than places, Sichem, or, as it was then called, Flavia Neapolis, has another, though inferior, claim to our regard as the birthplace of one of the most celebrated Fathers of the ante-Nicene Church, the one whose writings most clearly disclose the actual conditions of that church, and reflect its character, doctrines, and discipline—Justin, the philosopher and martyr. From Justin's own name and that of his father Priscus, we should judge him to be of Roman descent, although the name of the grandfather, Bacchius, savours of a Grecian origin (Apol. I. 1), and the literature in which he distinguished himself was Grecian. But the Greek was the current language of the world in his day, and for centuries both before and since, while the only existing philosophy had so completely adapted itself to the Hellenic modes of thought and vehicles of expression, that it was scarcely deemed possible to philosophize through any other medium. His education, like that of every distinguished Asiatic of the period, was conducted in Greek; he spoke it as his vernacular tongue, and, not more from its use in the schools than from native habit and its universal prevalence, adopted it in his writings. As a youth he developed the finest moral qualities, his heart pursuing wisdom from school to school with unwaning ardour, grappling with the most abstruse questions in metaphysics and ethics then agitated among men of thought, and ready to die at any moment for the sake of truth. The religious tendencies of the man exhibit themselves at a very early period of his career, and Stoic and Peripatetic, Pythagorean and Platonist, are chiefly frequented for the purpose of setting his mind at rest upon the vital questions of Deity, and the relations of Deity to the human race. But unworthy of their function, and degenerating from the high character of the fathers of these sects, who were not less earnest than able men, the philosophers whom it was young Justin's lot to encounter were at once feeble and trifling, wearing, indeed, their clerical garb and repeating their philosophical liturgy—the one, however, merely a cloak for hypocrisy, the other simply as a source of gain. Disappointed with their obvious lack of deep interest in the moral questions which absorbed his whole soul, and disgusted with their too palpable inefficiency, conceit, and unconcealed cupidity, he forsook the schools, and his thoughts turned inward upon himself, anxious to find out in communion with his own soul and with nature a solution of the questions that perplexed him. His

Digitized by Google

His resort was the shore of the resounding sea, the grandeur of the object and the loneliness of the spot the chief attraction to his mind. Alexandria or Ephesus—for both have their advocates—was the place of his sojourn at this period, both distinguished by the residence of learned men, and either of them a city where, more probably than anywhere in Palestine, he might have aid in pursuing the studies on which he had entered. On one occasion we find him wrapped in thought at his accustomed haunt, pacing up and down by the side of the sea, which moaned in melancholy unison with his reflections; when shortly came up a man of venerable aspect, sage and grave, with whom he conversed upon the subjects uppermost in his thoughts. Somewhat enamoured of the Platonic philosophy, which he had last studied, and which in the account it takes of spiritualism strides immensely in advance of the others, he argues in its favour with the appositely present senior, and contends that at some future day it will conduct him into that nearer acquaintance with God, the great object of his quest, which the Platonists term the 'vision of divinity.' This is shown to be impossible by philosophy of any school, and by unaided mind of the highest order, and the fallacy of the tenets of Plato is proved in some two or three points of doctrine belonging to his system, the doubting and indocile disciple being visited with the curt and not gentle apostrophe, 'You are a mere dealer in words, but no lover of action and truth; your aim is not to be a practiser of good, but a clever disputant, a cunning sophist.'

Such is the substance of his own relation in the commencement of his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, which we shall give in a little more fulness of detail in his own terms on a future page. We must not, however, defer the avowal of our conviction that we are disposed to regard this entire narrative as apocryphal, with Leclerc and Credner, and as having a very slight, if any, substratum in fact at all, for the same reasons that lead us to look upon the whole dialogues with Trypho as rather expositions of what might be said in controversy with a Jew than as close records of actual conversations. The old man appears very dramatically upon the scene, and sustains his part well in the business of Justin's conversion, and may have been designed to suggest Polycarp, or some other celebrated elder of the church, as his casual instructor, or even perhaps one of the 'angels unawares.' He is obviously, however, from the style of composition adopted, nothing more than an embellishment, like the genius of Socrates or Plato, the Deipnosophists of Athenæus, the Mycillus of Lucian, and the Moralists of Plutarch. A 'deus ex machina' has been a common device of composition both among Christians and Pagans in all ages. Juvenal's ancient friend (Sat. iii.) very fitly speaks the

Digitized by Google

sentiments of Juvenal. It is convenient to put in the mouth of a third party what might be hazardous or incongruous in our own. Let any one compare, just for satisfaction's sake, some corresponding picture in Plato, from the commencement of the Phædrus, the Phædon, the Alcibiades, or the Protagoras, any one, in short, in which the picturesque and dramatic element prevails, and see whether we can assign this incident to any category more decided than the possible, or believe in its egress through any portal less opaque than ivory. It must not be lost sight of, too, that Justin was an enthusiastic Platonist, and affected in his form of teaching the style not less than the garb of his philosophic master.

Engaged at last by these or other means in the study of what he himself designates 'the only safe and profitable philosophy,'[a] and 'the true doctrines, those of the Christians,'[b] the earnest inquirer becomes the satisfied believer, and gives himself to the defence and propagation of the faith he had embraced. In the prosecution of this design he travelled, it is believed, at least as far as Rome, taught there a considerable time, and wrote much. The chronological data of his Apologies, from their containing the names of the emperors to whom they are addressed, are more satisfactory than the mere incidental allusions dropped in his other pieces; but even these will not suffice to fix the date of their composition within a year or two. The different editors take a range of some dozen years, from 138 to 150 of our Lord, and the true date probably approximates the former figure. By comparison with the writings of certain futhers of the church further on in the same century, the Apologies are fully ascertained to belong to the period we have assigned to them, Irenæus, for instance, Minutius Felix, and Tertullian seeming to quote almost verbally some of their more striking statements and expressions.

There can be little doubt that the place where they were composed was Rome, as Eusebius declares (*H. E.* iv. 11), confirmed as this is in the case of the smaller Apology at least by the obvious allusion in its commencement to events happening in Rome only a day or two preceding. Besides these he has composed other works still extant, namely, an 'Exhortation to the Greeks,' a 'Fragment on the Resurrection,' ascribed to him, and the celebrated 'Dialogue with Trypho,' which contains a more full development of his theology than any of his other compositions, and is the most valuable of them all. But the larger portion of the treatises of this voluminous writer has been lost, proof presumptive to us that, despite of his reputation, there was not after

[a] Ταύτην μόνην φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον.—Dial. c. Tryph.
[b] τοῖς ἀληθέσι λόγοις, τοῖς τῶν Χριστιανῶν.—Act. Mart.

Digitized by Google all

all enough of the rich ore of genius lodged in them to secure their currency among posterity; our belief being that, on a broad view of the losses of our literature during the dark ages, not much has passed out of life which had intrinsic claims to survival. Besides these, Photius, in his *Myriobiblos*, tells us of a forcible 'Treatise against the first and second Books of Physical Auscultation, or against Form, Matter, and Privation,' as also one against the 'Fifth Substance and Perpetual Motion' of Aristotle; moreover one entitled 'Summary Solutions of Doubts against the Christian Religion.' He composed, moreover, according to the same author, a work against the Gentiles, called the 'Elenchus,' another upon the 'Monarchy of God,' another entitled 'Psaltes,' polemic discourses against Marcion, and a useful exposure of all heresies. In addition to these Eusebius informs us that Justin wrote commentaries upon the soul, taking up the various views held by the ancient philosophers on the subject, but this, with all the last named, has been lost. These two writers speak in exalted terms of his talents, Eusebius saying of him at his earlier period, that Justin 'has left us very many monuments of his well-trained understanding, replete with the richest profit;'[c] while Photius declares that he had reached the very summit of sacred and profane philosophy, and overflowed with the wealth of manifold learning and historical knowledge.[d] It is certainly not our purpose to depreciate Justin below his real merits, nevertheless we cannot help conceiving that he owed much of the high estimate formed of his abilities to the rareness of the alliance of philosophy with the Church at that early period of its history, to the number of his works, the valorousness of his championship of truth, and, perhaps, most of all, to the evident and glowing sincerity of his attachment to the sacred cause. Be this as it may, we cannot help believing that to the prestige of his name, far more than to his actual achievements on its behalf, has the Church been indebted for the good he may have done, and that he has himself owed to the same cause the larger moiety of his fame. That our readers may judge for themselves how this question ought to be decided, the task we have proposed is to present in an analytical and abbreviated form all the ascertained works of the author. leaving no fact or marked opinion out essential to the integrity of our purpose and the correctness of the desired decision. This course will spare them the heavy office which we have undertaken as a labour of love on their behoof, of wading through the

[c] πλεῖστα δὲ οὗτος καταλέλοιπεν ἡμῖν πεπαιδευμένης διανοίας ὑπομνήματα, πάσης ὠφελείας ἔμπλεα.—*Eccl. Hist.* iv. 11.

[d] ἔστι δὲ φιλοσοφίας μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ τὸ τε καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ μάλιστά γε τῆς θύραθεν εἰς ἄκρον ἀνηγμένος, πολυμαθείας τε καὶ ἱστοριῶν περιῤῥεόμενος πλούτῳ.

folio

Digitized by Google

folio (Coloniæ, 1686) containing the allowed and reputed works of Justin, while it will put them in possession of all the facts of the case. Where either expressions or passages of more than common interest occur, we shall quote them *in extenso*, and seek our apology in their importance.

We have only further to say, before laying these before our readers, that after a life of exemplary piety he attained the crown of eternal life by martyrdom in the flower of his age, having found his denouncer in a Cynic philosopher called Crescens.

The superscription of the larger and, as it is now generally called, THE FIRST APOLOGY, runs thus:—

'To the Emperor Titus Ælius Adrianus Antoninus Pius Augustus Cæsar, and to Verissimus his son the philosopher, and to Lucius the philosopher the son of Cæsar, and the adopted of Pius, &c.'*

'I, Justin, the son of Priscus, who was the son of Baccheius, natives of Flavia Neapolis of Syria Palæstina, make this appeal and supplication on behalf of the ill-used Christians, being myself one of that persecuted sect.'

Such being the superscription, there follows directly a most manly assertion of the right of the Christians to justice, and an appeal to the emperor grounded on his philosophic character and pretensions to be prompt to render them what they no less deserved than desired. Justin professes to scorn adulation as a means to help the Christians to redress, and asks for nothing more than an honest decision on the merits of their case after due inquiry, professing readiness to meet the alternative of condemnation in the almost scriptural terms suggested by Plato, 'You may kill, but you cannot really injure us.' He states that they had a ground of complaint in the circumstance that the mere name of Christian was sufficient to condemn them at any heathen tribunal, and proves that this was in the majority of cases their only crime by their instant acquittal when they consented to renounce Christianity. That the evil lives of some professors was no argument against the system he defended, any more than the dissoluteness of a philosopher or the profanity of a heathen would be considered conclusive against the claims of philosophy or Jupiter. Why could not the same charitable judgment be extended to the Christian religion, and those who allowed the impious wits of their own creed to laugh down and decry the pagan denizens of Olympus, excuse the zeal of the godly men who with deep-felt earnestness of soul denounced them? But the reason of this difference he finds in the influence of malignant demons, the

* Αὐτοκράτορι Τίτῳ Αἰλίῳ Ἀδριανῷ Ἀντωνίνῳ Εὐσεβεῖ Σεβαστῷ Καίσαρι καὶ Οὐηρισσίμῳ υἱῷ φιλοσόφῳ καὶ Λουκίῳ φιλοσόφῳ Καίσαρος φύσει υἱῷ καὶ Εὐσεβοῦς εἰσποιήτῳ, κ. τ. λ.

Digitized by Google same

same who wrought impurity with the daughters of men in the antediluvian world, and who now finding a foe to their continued dominion in the spread of divine truth, set themselves to molest its advocates. One of their common devices was to stigmatize the Christians with the appellation of atheists, a name the apologist repudiates, and the inapplicability of which he shows. How could they be atheists who worshipped 'the most true God, the Father of righteousness, chastity, and other virtues,' and 'his Son,' 'and the prophetic Spirit?' It is true convictions have taken place of the Christians time after time, but the fault has, as usual, lain with their religion and not with their misdeeds, and their resolute adherence to that religion in the very presence of death. In the strong and noble language of Justin 'they scorned to purchase life at the expense of a lie.' They had constantly before them a vivid prospect of eternity, its joys and its sorrows. With Plato they believed in a future judgment, the judge being Christ, but not Rhadamanthus and Minos—the consequences everlasting, not for a thousand years. To the folly of idolatry they could not submit, while in its guilt they dare not involve themselves. The idol, not seldom molten out of vessels of dishonour, and fashioned by artificers of notorious lewdness, men who were mere beasts in all things besides their craft, they could not dignify with the incommunicable name of God. Nor is it to be believed that the spiritual and unnameable Being whom they worshipped was to be approached with material offerings, such as garlands and victims, but with the homage of a mind conformed to his own. For he who created them at the first without their choice would re-create them by his regenerating power, exercised in harmony with their will: for God persuades only, and draws us gently in our regeneration by co-operating freely with those rational powers he has bestowed upon us. And Christianity has claims upon encouragement rather than discountenance from civil rulers, inasmuch as it seeks to secure the obedience of the heart, which human laws cannot command. Nor was their commonly bruited expectation of a kingdom to be misinterpreted into disloyalty to existing institutions, for their readiness to die to enter it was sufficient proof that it was a kingdom beyond the grave which they expected. Christianity always teaches men to keep eternity in view, and thus more effectually aids the civil governor in the maintenance of order than any precautions of his can do. The omniscience of God, which the Christian so constantly recognizes, is the best preservative from crime; nor can any just or merciful ruler prohibit its inculcation, as its chief effect will be to rob the executioner of his employment and his fees. Nevertheless, should even those princes who affect the

Digitized by Google

the designation *pious* and *philosophers*, persecute Christians because this and other kindred truths were taught by them, the very trial they endured would but confirm their faith in the religion they had embraced, because this treatment was foretold them by their master Jesus Christ, the Logos, the Son and Apostle of God. But the whole matter of our defence is sufficiently important to demand enlargement upon the theme. It is not an easy task for men bowed down with years of ignorance to be set upright in a moment, and darkness must be dispelled by fuller light. To revert to the charge of atheism—look at the nature of our religious services, and the Being we profess to worship, the immutable eternal God, Jesus Christ the Son of God 'second in order, and the prophetic Spirit the third,' and say is not this sufficient refutation of the charge? Besides our altered lives speak in favour of our doctrine, having been before unruly, now obedient—impure, now chaste—given to magic, now devoted to God—avaricious, now benevolent; hating one another for national or other peculiarities, now generous and loving-hearted—once revengeful, but now forgiving, and praying that our enemies may share the same peace and joy as ourselves. But examine as princes who are well able to judge the very teachings of Christ himself, upon the most essential points of morality;—'Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart before God.' 'Pray for your enemies, love those that hate you.' 'Swear not at all, but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay.' 'Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' 'Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things which are God's.' Acting up to this closing precept we worship God only, but to you we render 'a cheerful obedience in all things else, acknowledging you to be emperors and rulers upon earth, and in praying that imperial majesty may be always found associated with true wisdom.'

But we shall not be the greatest losers if unjust treatment follow on our holding doctrines so divine. The soul is immortal, and our persecutors must perish; and its immortality is as clearly implied in the arts of necromancy, the consultation of oracles, and the doctrines of many of your writers, both philosophers and poets, as it is distinctly revealed by Christianity, which assures that not only will the soul live on without intermission after death, but that the body will live again. And this is no greater wonder than the daily miracles of human generation, that strange process which no one would beforehand deem sufficient to produce such mighty results. Difficult, therefore, as it may seem to explain or understand the resurrection, the way of faith is easy in regard to

Digitized by Google

to it since it has been revealed; and our master Christ has taught us, 'that the things which are impossible with men are possible with God.' But in many other points our views are supported by the conjectures of your own writers, the harmony of the universe by Plato, the conflagration of all things by the Stoics, that souls live after death by most authors, the folly of idol-worship by Menander, belief in a human son of the divine parent by all who maintain that Jupiter had sons. What sons they were too, to name is to condemn them—Mercury, Æsculapius, Bacchus, Hercules, Pollux, Castor, Perseus; objects of worship, with their father, whose life was one round of outrage and impurity, his whole history the greatest reproach to the system of which he is the head. To the title Word of God given to Jesus, you possess a parallel in the case of Mercury. That he died on the cross is no more strange than that Jupiter's offspring should die as all did, although by other deaths. As to his being born of a virgin, that may not surprise, for Perseus is an instance of a similar kind; and in healing disease his fame is only emulous of your Æsculapius. But our faith in these things is not founded on analogous facts and doctrines being broached by pagan writers, but on the assurance that they are 'truth, and nothing but truth.' But neither their truth is to be our shield nor falsehood to be any excuse for us. Men who worship trees, rivers, mice, cats, crocodiles, and other like stupid things, are tolerated or pitied, but we are pursued with rancour because we dare abstain from publicly revering the country's gods which are the country's shame. It is true we do contemn—we cannot do otherwise—Bacchus son of Semele, Apollo son of Latona, Proserpina, and Venus smitten with the love of Adonis, and Æsculapius, for now we worship 'the unbegotten, impassible God,' whose purity is stained with no amours with Antiope, Ganymede, etc., and whose power stands in no need of relief by the giant with the hundred hands. But demons must have won such grossnesses belief, else they never could have been believed, those spirits which have always opposed and travestied the truth. To their agency must we ascribe the wide popularity of the impostor Simon not only at Rome, where his statue may be seen, but also in Samaria, and the popularity of Marcion of Pontus, who lowers the Creator of the world into a Deity subordinate to the great universal God. Whether these heretics are really guilty of the crimes charged upon the Christians at large we cannot say, but this we cannot but perceive, that a toleration is extended to the enemies of our faith that never has been vouchsafed to ourselves. Not only do we affirm ourselves to be free from the cannibal propensities and brutal connections with which calumny has blackened us,

Digitized by Google

us, but also from many vices unreproved among you. The exposure of infants, male and female, we condemn, because, if spared, they are educated to be ministers of the vilest lusts; and if they perish, the guilt of murder lies upon their unnatural parents. The marriage of Christians is for the highest social and religious ends, and the benefit, not the destruction, of their children is constantly kept in view; while such believers as remain unmarried prove their devoted chastity by the means which are frequently taken in order to preserve it. The infamy of such court favourites as the heathen Antinous is too recent to be forgotten, as repugnant to the principles as alien from the practice of the followers of Christ.

To justify, however, our faith in this divine personage we now present a few considerations in support of his divinity, rather quoting the prophecies fulfilled in his person and life, than trusting to reports which may be untrue. Amongst the Hebrews existed a class of men called prophets, whom the prophetic spirit enabled to foretell things to come long before they came into being, and these predictions they wrote in their mother tongue in sacred books. These were translated at the instance of Ptolemy of Alexandria, and became known all over the world, in the hands of every Jew; but they had not the effect of abating the rancour of that ancient people against us, as our recent treatment by the rebel Barchochebas proves. Now, in these books of the prophets it is foretold—five thousand, three thousand, two thousand, one thousand years before his coming—that one should be born like Christ of a virgin—work miracles, even to raising the dead, be put to death on the cross, rise from the grave, and be and be called the Son of God. Among these prophecies is one to this effect, 'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet,' until he come for whom it is reserved. Of this you are yourselves the proof: the country of Judea having become a Roman province directly after the coming of Jesus Christ. Other matters connected with this prophecy are equally true and significant. Then Isaiah, another prophet, says, 'There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Rod shall come forth out of the root of Jesse, and to it shall the Gentiles seek,' Jacob and Jesse being among his lineal ancestry. Again, the same prophet predicts that 'a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel, that is God with us,'—a conception not resulting from intercourse with a lustful Jove, but, remaining a virgin, by the ineffable overshadowing of the Holy Ghost. The place of his birth was also truly predicted by the same prophets—'And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah,' etc.—and that Christ was born here the census of Cyrenius shows. And very particular declarations

Digitized by Google

tions of the prophets are fulfilled in the same accurate manner, the Spirit speaking by various sacred writers, and in various forms, sometimes as from himself, sometimes as the prophet, sometimes as the divine Father, sometimes as Christ, but all concurring to the same end to picture the life and death, the sufferings and glory of the Lord. Our strange progress in the world is also foretold—'Out of Zion shall go forth a law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem,'—twelve men without parts and learning subjugating the world to the dominion of Christ. Such influence has their teaching had, that not even by subterfuge will Christians save their lives, although your heathen poet would justify that course—'My tongue has sworn, my mind has not.' The very troops of your army remain faithful to their oath, amid privation and in the presence of death, much more we who serve for an incorruptible reward. David prophesies of our preachers of the Gospel in these terms—'There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard;' and of the life and sufferings, the death and triumph of Christ—opposition being fruitless to prevent his reign—in the first and second Psalms. He also prophesies of his kingdom—a kingdom to commence after his crucifixion, 'Let the whole earth stand in awe of Him, and let it be established, and let it not be shaken (Ps. xcvi.): Let them rejoice among the nations, for the Lord reigneth from the tree.' The language of prophecy often speaks as if things were *past:* this only expresses the certainty of their fulfilment. David spake of Christ eleven hundred years before his advent; nevertheless the certainity of foretold events does not interfere with the freedom of man's will, for 'unless we suppose that mankind have it in their power to choose the good and refuse the evil, no one can be accountable for any action whatever.' The sudden changes from evil to good and from good to evil prove perfect liberty in the agent; besides, were destiny the cause of it, the same destiny would be the parent of good and evil alike, and they would lose their respective natures. 'Man is not, like a tree or a beast, without the power of election,' but rewarded according to his works, which implies volition to regulate his actions. God also, by Moses, teaches this doctrine, saying, 'Behold, good and evil is before thee, choose the good' (Deut. xxx. 19); and by Isaiah, 'Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings.' (i. 16.) When, therefore, Plato said that 'the blame lies at his door who wills the sin, but God is without blame,' he borrowed from Moses; the prevailing notions of the heathen philosophers about the immortality of the soul, future punishments, etc., were all derived from the sacred writers. To divine prescience, then, not to fatal necessity, do we ascribe the predictions

Digitized by Google

dictions of prophecy, and the doctrine of retribution to God's concern about mankind and a recognition of their free will.

But to read the writings of our prophets or those of Hystaspes, or of the Sibylla, at the prompting of the devil ye have made a capital crime. But the devil has missed his aim, as we not only read them at the peril of our own life, but propagate them wherever we can, sufficiently rewarded if we gain only a fine. But to return from this digression: it was prophesied of Christ, that after his resurrection he should reign at the right hand of his Father till his enemies were made his footstool. 'The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Jerusalem,' is a part fulfilment of this prediction in the success attending the preachers who issued from Jerusalem with the most powerful doctrine of Christ. It is true that ere the coming of the Logos in the flesh those of the Greeks, like Socrates or Heraclitus, who lived according to reason, and Abraham, Ananias, Misael, Azarias, and Elias, among the barbarians, may be said to have been even then in some sort Christians, because regulated by the universal reason which Christ was, but now faith in the Messiah is required of all. Again, prophecy has foretold, 'Zion is a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation;' again, 'Your country is desolate, strangers devour it in your presence;' both which ye have strangely fulfilled, 'for ye have made it capital in a Jew to set a foot in his own country.' It was further predicted that Christ should cure diseases, 'the lame shall leap like a stag,' etc.; and that he performed this you may easily be satisfied from the acts of Pontius Pilate. That he should die was thus foretold—'Behold how the righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart.' That the Gentiles should worship Him whom the Jews rejected, is also predicted in these words, 'I am sought of them that asked not for me, I am found of them that sought me not.' That He should become man for the sake of mankind, suffer, and rise to glory, I will now show from various prophecies:—'They delivered his soul unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors.' (Isa. liii.) 'As many were astonished at Thee, so thy form shall be with honour from men.' (Isa. lii.) 'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities,' etc. (liii.) For these humiliations his disciples forsook him, but assured afterwards of his resurrection, went abroad through the world to preach his truth, and were denominated Apostles. That his generation was inexplicable was implied in the question, 'Who shall declare his generation?' That he should ascend to heaven—'Lift up the gates of heaven, and be ye lift up, that the King of Glory may enter in:' that he shall come again from heaven with great splendour—'Behold one like the Son of Man cometh with the clouds of heaven!'

As

Digitized by Google

As prophecy has been so wondrously fulfilled in the first coming of the Messiah, how can we refuse to believe that it will be also fulfilled in his second coming, to raise and judge all the men that ever had a being? Of that second advent Ezekiel has spoken thus—'The bones shall come together, bone to his bone, and flesh shall come upon them,' etc. That the wicked shall have torment in the world to come, Isaiah predicts in the words—'Their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched.' What the unbelieving among the Jews will do in the last day Zechariah foretels—'And tribe shall mourn to tribe, and they shall look upon him whom they have pierced.' Now why should we not believe these things, having seen them ourselves fulfilled; or how else could we come to believe a crucified man, the first begotten of the unbegotten God? We are not such fools as to believe without evidence, nor 'such romancers as dress up stories about the fictitious progeny of Jove; mighty talkers, but able to prove nothing.' It was also foretold that more Gentiles should believe than Jews, according to this, 'Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear—for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife:'—of the Jews, indeed, only a remnant, after that of the same prophet, 'the Lord of Hosts left unto us a small remnant.' Jeremy also avouches the same—'All the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart, but the Gentiles in the foreskin.' Such proofs as these might well awaken a firm faith in your minds, but that the devilcraft of Satan has introduced all these things in a fictitious form into the writings of your poets, to pre-occupy them with the notion of their falsehood, as all forgeries alike, and thus keep you in the darkness of ignorance. For instance, Moses said of the Messiah—'binding his foal unto the vine, and washing his garments in the blood of the grape.' This has led the devil to ascribe to Bacchus sonship to Jove, the invention of the vine, the introduction of wine into the mysteries, and an ascension into heaven. And Bellerophon, from the same prophecy, has been made to ride to heaven upon a winged-horse, Pegasus. And, as Christ was to be born of a virgin, Perseus was palmed upon the world as of like descent. And, as the Psalm called him,—'Rejoicing as a giant to run his course,' Hercules was made to run over the whole earth. And as he was to heal disease, Æsculapius must be invented to imitate him in this. But none of Jove's sons was ever said to have been crucified—an oversight of the devil—yet the cross as a symbol abounds everywhere: for cast your eyes upon the world, and tell me whether anything is transacted, any commerce maintained, without the resemblance of a cross? Without this trophy of ours you cannot go to sea, for navigation depends upon sails, and they

Digitized by Google

are hung in fashion of a cross: there is neither ploughing nor digging, nor any handicraft work performed, without instruments of this figure; nay, a man is distinguished from a beast by the uprightness of his body, and the extension of his arms, and the prominency of the nose he breathes through, which are all representations of the cross, in allusion to which the prophet thus speaks:—'The breath of our nostrils, Christ the Lord.' Moreover your banners declare the power of this figure, etc. But not only before Christ's coming did demons foist fictitious sons of Jove upon the world, but since have set up many impostors, among others the two Samaritans, Menander and Simon, to the latter of whom a statue was raised by the senate, like to other gods, the which we pray you would pull down. These seducing spirits also do all they can to smother the notion of hell-fire, but to little purpose with any except those who are obstinate slaves to their lusts, and all such hate and persecute us, but we do not hate them in return, but pity them. Marcion of Pontus has been another prime agent of these spirits of darkness, on whom abundance of people have pinned their faith. But now, to show that Plato borrowed from our teachers—and we speak of the Logos (doctrine) that was by means of the prophets—mark that Moses describes the creation of the world out of chaos ages before the Greek philosopher—'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, and the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep.' Moses also speaks of your Erebus or Hell. And whereas Plato philosophizing about the Son of God, says:—'He expressed him in the universe in the figure of the letter X,' he took the hint from Moses, who, by means of this sign, killed the serpents in the desert and saved the people. The third power in the universe he takes from the Spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters, thus expressing himself—'The third about the third.' Moses foretold the general conflagration in the words—'An everlasting fire shall descend, and burn unto the lowest hell.' We then do not take our opinions from others, but they from us—our poorest and rudest being in these things as wise as the philosopher.

I shall now lay before you the manner of dedication to God in use amongst us after our conversion to God through Christ. After prayer and fasting we are brought to a place of water and there regenerated by baptism in the name of God the Father and Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. This baptism is called illumination, because the minds of those who learn these things are illuminated. They are also baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost, who spake by the prophets and foretold everything concerning Christ. But the devils have taught the people to mimic this baptism as soon as ever it was spoken of by the prophets,

Digitized by Google

prophets, for they sprinkle and wash from head to foot ere they officiate in the temples and offices of religion; they are also taught to put off their shoes in imitation of the command to Moses, the great and astonishing actions of whom you may read in his own writing, being addressed by Christ out of a burning bush, and leading the people out of captivity in Egypt. But the Jewish doctors teach that it was the unnameable God who spake out of the bush, who are justly reproved by Isaiah—'The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib, but Israel doth not know me, my people hath not understood me.' The Jews do not know the Logos of God, his son, his Angel and Messenger, who conveyed the divine will into the world, as our Lord hath testified—'He that heareth me heareth Him that sent me!' This divine Messenger sometimes appeared as fire, sometimes as an angel, and in these last days as a man, who, nevertheless, is the Son of the Father of the universe, and being the Logos, and first begotten of God, is God.

But the malice of demons is further seen in setting up the image of Proserpina on the fountains of water, in imitation of the Spirit of God on the waters, and representing Minerva as the produce of Jehovah's brain in imitation of the Logos or wisdom of the eternal God, 'though I cannot but think it extremely ridiculous to represent the notion of a mind by the form of a woman.' After the believer is baptized he is led to the congregation of the brethren, where we pour out our souls in common prayer. Prayers over, we salute each other with a kiss; after this, bread and a cup of wine and water are brought to the president of the brethren, who offers up thanksgiving over them in a prayer of more than ordinary length. The people say audibly Amen at its close. Those we call deacons distribute to every one present this eucharistical bread and wine, and then they carry it to the absent. Of this food none are allowed to be partakers but true believers, for we do not take this as common bread or common wine. This also has been parodied in the Mysteries of Mithra. On the day called Sunday all that live in the same city or country assemble in one place, where the writings of the Apostles and Prophets are read, and the president (ὁ προεστώς) makes a sermon, at the conclusion of which we pray, then receive the Eucharist, the president closing with prayer and thanksgiving according to his ability. And all contribute as they are able for the indigent, the orphan and the widow, the sick and the stranger; the president being the almoner of the Church for all the needy. On Sunday we assemble, because it is the first day of creation and that of the resurrection of Christ.

'Now so far as these things shall appear agreeable to truth and reason, so far we desire, you would pay regard to them, but if they seem

Digitized by Google

seem trifling, despise them as trifles; however, do not proceed against people of most innocent lives, as severely as against your enemies; for we must warn you that if you persist in a course of injustice, you shall not escape the vengeance of God. But be this as it will, you shall hear us contentedly cry out, God's will be done! And although we might have pleaded the rescript of your father, the great and illustrious Emperor Adrian, in our behalf for the moderating your proceedings according to that rule of equity we have ourselves proposed, yet we have not insisted so much upon the authority of Adrian as upon the justice of our demands, which was the reason of composing this apology and exposition of the Christian faith. We have nevertheless subjoined a copy of Adrian's epistle to let you see the justice and truth of our cause: and the copy is this:—

'*The Rescript of Adrian for the Christians to Minutius Fundanus.*

'I received a letter from the illustrious Serenus Granianus, your predecessor. It is an affair well worthy your consideration to put a stop to the vexatious suits and to give no licence to informers to carry on the trade of malice. If then, the people under your government have anything to say against Christians, and will prove it in public, so that Christians may answer for themselves in open court, it is your duty to hear them in a judicial way only, and not to be overborne by the petitions and clamours of the people: for to you it belongs, not to the multitude, to judge of the merits of the cause. If, therefore, the informer shall make it appear that Christians have done anything contrary to law, punish them according to the nature of their crime: so also, on the contrary, if you find it to be a malicious charge, only take care to condemn and punish as the malice deserves.'

THE SECOND APOLOGY is inscribed indifferently to the Roman Senate and to the Emperor Verus, for while it bears the superscription to the Senate,[f] Eusebius declares it was actually presented to the namesake and successor of Antoninus.[g] This document begins in the following strain:—

'The things which occurred yesterday, and in the days immediately preceding, in your city under Urbicius, and which are happening everywhere under the magistrates, contrary to every show of reason, constrain me to address to you the present appeal on behalf of certain ill-used persons who are possessed of the same nature as yourselves, and who are thus your brethren, though, haply, slighted on account of the meanness of their condition. Every one receives kind treatment from his rulers except the Christian; and from the judges who are under the influence of demons, their common award is death. The statement to which your attention is now called is the following. A woman who had once lived in a state of great impurity in wedlock, having been taught the pure doctrines of Christianity,

[f] πρὸς τὴν Ῥωμαίων σύγκλητον.

[g] πρὸς τὸν Ἀντωνῖνον Οὐῆρον.—Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 18; iv. 11.

sought

Digitized by Google

sought to induce her husband to exhibit a more chaste conversation, but not being able to persuade him to this course, adopted the severe measure of procuring a divorce from him. Full of spite, he denounced her as a Christian, and presented a libel to that effect to the Emperor. But the husband withdrew his prosecution, and turned his vengeance on her teacher, one Ptolemy, whom he contrived to have thrown into prison. He was tortured and condemned on professing himself a Christian, as well as Lucius, who volunteered his defence, to whom a third victim was afterwards joined, all professing themselves grateful for the sentence which dismissed them to happiness in heaven. Why not all kill yourselves then? some will say;—because the very interests we uphold would become extinct thereby—none would live to propagate truth—the very race of man would perish from the earth were such a practice universal. But if, again, it be said that were God our friend, as we aver him to be, we should not suffer as we do, our reply is this, that the perils we undergo are the work of demons—not of divine providence—demons, the offspring of angels who fell by intercourse with women, and are the source of all ills, murders, vices, adulteries, and lusts. Each of these is called by a name, but our God is unnameable, Father, God, Creator, Lord, Master, being not proper, but descriptive names. Christ has a name from God, being anointed of Him, but the signification is not fully comprehensible, while Jesus signifies the human Saviour. He was begotten of his God and Father for the salvation of all who believe, and the confusion of demons. Hence Christians expel demons, by a simple adjuration in the name of Christ, from the bodies of those possessed, whom your charmers treat in vain. For our sakes the world is yet preserved, though reserved for fire at last; but for this it would be consumed at once, just as the flood spared only one Noah, your Deucalion. The forbearance of Christ allows demons still to inflict wrong on the virtuous, like the poisoned Socrates, and bestow prosperity on the vicious, like Epicurus and Sardanapalus. This must not be ascribed to Fate, as the Stoics do, for Fate would destroy volition, but angels and men have free will, may do right or wrong, therefore the wrong-doer will be punished at last. The very Stoics inculcate moral precepts, which implies free will in the disciples. But good men have been always hated, much more the followers of the seminal reason and universal word: I too may expect to suffer by some enemy of the truth, a Crescens, a lover of darkness and vanity, and not a lover of wisdom[h] as he is called, who dares

[h] The words of Justin here are τοῦ φιλοψόφου καὶ φιλοκόμπου οὐ γὰρ φιλόσοφον—τὸν ἄνδρα. Eusebius varies it curiously—τοῦ ἀφιλοσόφου, κ. τ. λ., *the unphilosophic*, the rest being exactly alike.

Digitized by Google

to slander us as atheists. In this he is either ignorant or untrue. I know him to be both. My controversy with him proves it, and shows that he has no principle of rectitude to guide him. But your so called philosophers say our doctrine of everlasting fire is not true; to which our brief reply is, then there is no God, no virtue and vice, and men are wrongly punished for transgressing the laws. That different things are good and bad in different places is the work of demons: but reason is uniform. Before Christ, Socrates spoke many things true, using the universal reason, and was hated for his truth; nevertheless no one dares to die for Socrates' opinions, but the very common people are ready to die for the truth of Christ. Nor could we die at all but that it is a debt we owe, and most cheerfully pay for Christ. The fable of your Xenophon is to our point, concerning the choice of Hercules, aptly representing as it does the Christian's own choice. For even when I followed the Platonists I never could persuade myself that men of abandoned and self-indulgent habits could die so cheerfully as the Christians did: none but those who lived reputably could resign life readily and happily. That men of good character should be robbed of life by violence is at the suggestion of evil spirits, who also persuade to the use of those tortures whereby confession is wrung from our servants, children, and wives, of enormities which the heathen only commit, though we are charged with them, such as Saturnian festivals, desecrated with human blood, and imitations of the impurity of Jupiter and other gods with men and women. These things we revolt against, and rejoice to live in the sight of God, who sees all things. Would that some one could loudly and effectually invite our slanderers to repent! But slandered though we be, I never concealed my profession of being a Christian. Not that I am altogether ashamed of the doctrines of Plato and other philosophers, as utterly unlike the Christian, for there is resemblance in many points, but in the matters of highest importance they failed to reach the certainty and consistency we possess. All the truth they had was ours. We worship next to God, the unbegotten and ineffable, the Word of God, which for our sakes became man and shared our woes. Be this our appeal then graciously received and published by the senate, that we be no longer exposed to harassing question and persecution, for we are persons of upright life, and the more as we have bid farewell to gods all whose history is infamy. Our principles are not base, but rather of a morality higher than man's—in the lowest case much unlike the Sotadic, Epicurean, and other infamies current among the Gentiles.'

The Dialogue with Trypho the Jew needs no other introduction

Digitized by Google

duction than an observation on its genuineness, which was learnedly and vehemently impugned at different times throughout the whole course of the last century on many grounds, some of pure criticism, some historical. The most serious objection was that of John James Wetstein, who charged the readings in Justin with a want of correspondence with those of the Seventy as exhibited in his day, and bearing resemblance to those of the later versions of Theodotion and Symmachus. Krome, Eichhorn, Credner, and others, have satisfactorily disposed of this objection by assuming either that the readings have been altered to harmonize with these versions, or else that the copies used by Justin were revised texts which afterwards came into the hands of these translators. Both these causes may have been in operation; but whether or no, the Dialogue may be assumed to be Justin's at once from the consent of antiquity, and the small damage the evidence in favour of its genuineness has received from the unfriendly sifting it has undergone. It contains a distinct reference to the larger Apology, and, as will be seen, describes the author as having been once a Platonic philosopher, which agrees to the very letter with Justin's personal history. Eusebius evidently describes this work in his Ecclesiastical History (iv. 18). The date of its composition it is impossible to ascertain. The supposed discussion it records occupied two days (p. 296, Coloniæ, 1686), but we cannot fix the spot satisfactorily where the hiatus should appear.

The Dialogue begins in the following manner:—

'As I was walking one morning in the Xystus, a person, attended by some friends, met me, and said, in a courteous manner, "Good morrow, philosopher;" at which saying they all turned about and joined me. "Pray, sir," said I to him again, "what is your business with me?"

'"I have been taught," said he, "by Corinthus, the Socratic philosopher at Argos, not to despise nor neglect those who appear in this garb, but rather to be kindly disposed towards them, and embrace all opportunities of conversing with them, that some advantage might accrue to either of us, and that it would be well for both if either of us should be profited thereby. For this reason, therefore, when I see any one in this garb I am accustomed to accost him readily. In accordance with my general practice I have now accosted you with pleasure: these my companions also are in hopes of hearing something useful from you."

'Then said I to him, in a jocular strain, "And pray, most excellent sir, who are you?" He at once told me ingenuously who and what he was. "My name," said he, "is Trypho; I am by circumcision a Hebrew, by reason of the late war a fugitive, and live now for the most part in Greece, and at Corinth."

'"But what," said I, "can you receive as much profit from philosophy, as from your own lawgiver and the prophets?"

'"Why

Digitized by Google

'"Why not?" said he: "are not all the discourses of the philosophers about God? are not all their dissertations inquiries concerning his supreme rule and providence? or is not the proper business of philosophy to search diligently into the nature of the Deity?"

'"Yes," said I, "such indeed is our opinion. But most of the philosophers are entirely regardless whether there be one or many gods: and whether their providential care is exercised over every one of us, or not, as if the knowledge of these things was not conducive to our happiness. Moreover they endeavour to persuade us that God exercises a providence over the universe at large, over genera and over species, but not over you and me and any other as individuals. From whence they infer that it is not necessary for us daily and nightly to address ourselves to God in prayer. For what end they inculcate this doctrine is not difficult to perceive. For a liberty of teaching or of being followers of those who propagate such notions permits men to speak and act as best suits their own inclinations, without dreading any punishment, or hoping any good at the hand of God. For how should they be influenced either with hope or fear who believe and assert that things will be hereafter as they now are; that each of us shall live in the next life just as we do in this; and that there will be no alteration in us either for the better or worse? But some who maintain that the soul is immortal and incorporeal, think whatsoever sin they commit they cannot be punished, because whatsoever is incorporeal is incapable of pain; and if the soul is immortal they have no further favour to ask of God."

'Then he, smiling pleasantly, said, "Will you be pleased to tell us what is your opinion of these things, the notion which you have of God, and what your philosophy is?"

'"Yes," said I, "I will open out to you my opinion of these things."'

After this mention of the circumstances in which the colloquy took place, the author proceeds to treat of the matters in debate between Jews and Christians in a threefold order—directing his first observations to the point of the abrogation of the law; in his second he expounds the chief facts and doctrines of the Christian scheme; and in the third proves by abundant citation from the Jewish scriptures themselves that the co-option of the Gentiles into the one church of God on earth was always contemplated and clearly predicted from the first; so that Judaism itself is made to preach Christianity. He introduces this matter by the account of his own history—his early frequenting of the philosophical schools, and his conversion from the casual interview with the venerable old gentleman at the private place near the sea. On these circumstances of his personal history already detailed we need not dwell. Having declared to Trypho his adhesion to the religion of Christ as 'the only safe and valuable philosophy,' the companions of Trypho laugh at the man's folly and enthusiasm, and

Digitized by Google

and the Jew himself urges an assumption of the Hebrew creed and ritual as essential to Justin's salvation. But Justin offers to argue the whole matter with his antagonist, and to present reasons sufficient to more than justify the course he was pursuing. He then asks Trypho did he believe the common slanders against the Christians of eating human flesh and indulging in promiscuous concubinage after their loathsome sacrament? To which the Jew replies it was impossible to believe these things, so repulsive were they to human nature, as well as so opposed to the precepts of their own Gospels. The only wonder of Trypho was that the life of the Christians was not more superhuman and holy in the presence of so sublime a moral code. Nevertheless not acknowledging its divinity, he charges Justin with sin in not submitting to the Jewish law, and receiving circumcision in proof thereof. To this the Christian philosopher replies, that there was a new law given, in accordance with ancient prediction, which annulled the old, and that this law was the Christ: that the Jews in refusing to receive the new law, and in practising various iniquities, were the real transgressors, and not the Christians: that remission of sins was not to be obtained by baths of blood or water, but by genuine repentance as Isaiah testified, and by the blood and death of Christ: that the true purification had respect to the soul, not the body: that the acceptable fast consisted in charity and piety: and their boasted circumcision was rather a token of God's anger than his favour, a badge whereby the Jews might be marked out for persecution wherever they came, a persecution they richly deserved for their malignant persecution of the Christians so long as they had the power. Nevertheless if Christians believed the Jewish rites to be of perpetual and universal obligation, they would observe them as much easier to keep than their own religious profession, which exposed to death constantly and demanded the suppression of even a revengeful thought. But circumcision is not necessary for salvation, for Adam, Abel, Enoch, Lot, Noah, Melchizedek were not circumcised, yet they enjoyed high favour with God. This and other ritual institutions were ordained because of the hardness of their hearts—the very eating of some meats and abstaining from others being designed to keep God constantly before the eyes of a forgetful people. The sabbaths were appointed for the same reason—that one day at least in the week might be secured for him who should have all. Sacrifice too did not originate in a divine need, but in a desire to concentrate upon God a worship that would have been directed in this way to idols. Circumcision is a mere sign, not righteousness, for Abraham was justified before he was circumcised, and women who may be pure and virtuous, fulfilling the moral law, cannot be circumcised.

Digitized by Google

circumcised. The true circumcision is that of the heart therefore, which comes by Christ. Not those who call themselves children of Abraham shall be saved, but those, Gentiles as well as Jews, who repent of sin and believe on Christ: and the injunction of Sabbath observance and circumcision, etc. etc., by the prophets is no argument for the perpetual obligation of these things, but only that the same hardness of heart still existed in the nation which required their appointment at first. Besides, mere circumcision will not of itself save any, for Egyptians, Moabites, and Edomites, who are idolaters, observe the rite, nor will the want of circumcision condemn the Scythian or the Persian who fears God and works righteousness. The grace to the Gentiles which we enjoy is 'what David sung to his psaltery, Isaiah foretold in evangelical strains, Zacharias proclaimed, and Moses described—Do you know them, Trypho? They are preserved in your sacred writings; or rather, I should have said in ours, not in yours. For we indeed believe and obey them: but you, when you read them, understand them not. Do not you be angry with us, nor reproach us for being uncircumcised, because God made us so; nor think it a terrible thing because we drink hot water on your Sabbath, seeing God conducts his government of the world on that day just as he does on all others; and your high priests, as on all other days, so also on this, are commanded to work in offering sacrifices; and since so many righteous men, who never observed any of the legal institutions, have obtained the approval of God.'

Evil spirits are subject to us through the power of God, and are exorcised by us with the name of Christ, proof that God approves our faith and obedience to Jesus. If in his humiliation such wonders attend his name, what may we not expect at his second coming in glory? Your contempt of the Messiah for his mean appearance arises from your overlooking those prophecies which foretell it. But both conditions are expressed in the 110th Psalm which you wrongly interpret of Hezekias, who was never a priest, much less one for ever. But Jesus is, and, like Melchizedek, a priest of the circumcised and uncircumcised alike. Nor can the 72nd Psalm be interpreted of Solomon, as you vainly strive to do; for the kings of the earth did not worship him, nor had he dominion to the ends of the earth. Besides Solomon became in his old age a bewitched idolater, a thing no torture could induce a Christian to become. But we grant that certain who call themselves Christians may offer to idols, but they are heretics of various name, and their course of procedure predicted in our sacred writings, Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians, Saturnilians, named after their chief, as the various sects of philosophy from their founder. Christ foretold all this, and his prescience proves him to be God. The further proofs you now demand

Digitized by Google I will

I will supply from the Scriptures. In the 24th Psalm Christ is called the King of Glory. The 47th and 99th Psalms accord him the highest titles of honour. The 15th Psalm too is throughout about Christ. Nor charge us with folly for believing these things, nor hate us for our profession of them. Nevertheless as you require proof that Jesus of Nazareth is that suffering and glorified Messiah, of whom the prophets have spoken, I will proceed to urge somewhat more than I have already delivered on this head, although enough has been said to satisfy persons without prejudice. First of all, then, observe the Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ, only designed to be a temporary institution, and the form in which it was roasted was a type of the cross: and the two goats of the day of atonement represent Christ in his humiliation and exaltation. Again, the offering of fine flour is a symbol of the eucharistical bread which we offer in remembrance of the sufferings of our Lord, of which further Malachi spake when he said, 'My name is glorified among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto my name and a pure offering.' We thus are alleged to glorify by our offering the name which you profane. Further, circumcision on the eighth day is a tribute of respect to Christ, for, counting from the first day, the eighth recurs on the first again—the day of the resurrection of Jesus. The twelve bells that hung on the high priest's ephod were a type of the twelve Apostles dependent on the power of Christ, the eternal priest; and, were it necessary, I could prove that 'all the other things commanded by Moses were only types and figures and representations of the actions and sufferings of Christ.' To pass on, however, from this, your prophets point to one to be born of a virgin as the true Messiah and the expected end of the law; but your rabbis mistranslate the passage, 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive,' and misapply it when they expound it as spoken in relation to Hezekiah. To save you from the perdition which your descent from Abraham will not avert if you still reject the truth, I shall endeavour to impress the truth as it is in Jesus on your heart. To your inquiry whether those who live according to the law of Moses will rise to a joyful resurrection as well as the righteous who died before the giving of the law, I answer, undoubtedly yes; not because it is Moses's law, but because it prescribes those laws which are universally righteous. To combine the observance of the Mosaic law now with faith in Christ is impossible, for no Christian can offer the Paschal Lamb now, as the antitype has been consummated, and as, in point of fact, no place remains to the Jews to offer it in, Jerusalem having been trodden down of the Gentiles. Nor is it necessary to observe sabbaths, circumcision, the months, or ablutions after

Digitized by Google

after contact with forbidden things and copulation, as the elder patriarchs often observed none of these, yet were on your own confession accepted of God. All that was peculiar in the circumcision of Abraham, and the rites of Moses afterwards, even to the phylactery, was enjoined lest the people should forget God, a sin to which they were prone, going so far in their apostacy as to offer their children in sacrifice to idols. Your further question, 'If any one, besides acknowledging Jesus to be Christ, should choose to observe the Mosaic institutions also, can he be saved?' I answer thus: 'I have the charity to think so, if he do not seduce others to imitate him by averring that they cannot be saved unless they do the same,' my charity leading me to think more favourably of such than some of our Christians do. To the weak who are simply misled my charity extends, but not to the wilful misleader. My solemn belief is that if any of your race, having professed belief in Christ, shall go back to the law, he cannot possibly be saved, nor any Jew who shall die such, especially if he be one who joins in cursing Christ in the synagogues, repentance indeed having power to blot out the guilt; but there must be repentance. Assuming then that Jesus is the promised Messiah, I will now address myself to prove what you consider incredible and absurd, that he was also God who existed from eternity, and not merely man of man. And even should I not be able to prove to your satisfaction this point, which some of our own profession do not hold, it need not at all shake your belief in the Messiahship of our Lord, which I consider a point settled beyond any further question. The Elias that was to precede the Messiah is John, who possessed the spirit of Elias, and whose history you know, that he should have the spirit of this distinguished prophet, being a parallel case with that of Joshua and Moses. You seem, says Trypho, to have acquired expertness in controversy from your frequent practice. You are so ready with an answer to everything—tell me now, however, how you will prove that there is any other God but one, the creator of the universe, and then you may proceed to prove that he condescended to be born of a virgin. To which I reply, let me first establish by quotation from Isaiah xl. that John is both the voice of one crying in the wilderness predicted there, and the Elias of Malachi. All the circumstances of the case prove it, and the express assertion of Jesus, 'if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come.' The patriarch Jacob, too, has foretold the advent of Messiah in terms that establish the claims of Jesus Christ, for the prince and the lawgiver have not ceased from Judah until He came who was the Expectation of the Gentiles. Moreover this part of the prophecy that he should 'bind his foal to the vine and his ass's colt to the choice vine'

Digitized by Google

vine' represents 'the Gentiles who were like a foal which had never borne any burden, nor had any yoke upon its neck till Christ came, who sent his disciples and converted them;' and the prophecy had further fulfilment in Christ's actually ordering his disciples to bring him an ass that was tied to a vine with her colt at the entrance of a village called Bethphage, on which he rode into Jerusalem, in accordance with the words of Zechariah—the ass representing the believers from among the Jews, as the colt those from among the Gentiles. Zechariah with equal clearness predicted 'that this Christ was to be smitten and his disciples scattered abroad.' Jacob's language that he should 'wash his garments in wine' means that he should wash those that believe in him in his blood, the phrase 'blood of the grape' elegantly signifying that Christ's blood was not of human generation, but like that of the grape directly from God. In proof of the divine nature of Christ, receive the visit of the angels to Abraham's tent at Mamre, from which it is evident that there 'really is another God and Lord inferior or subordinate to the creator of all things, who is also called the Angel or Messenger, because he communicates to mankind all those things which it is the will of the Creator of all things, above whom there is no God, should be communicated to them, 'different in order but not in will,' 'the Lord who rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven.' The appearances to Jacob in Charran and Bethel were of the same Lord and God, as also to Moses in Egypt, 'not God, the creator of all things, but the same that appeared to Abraham, subservient to the will of the creator of the universe.' I will produce also another proof, my friends, said I, from the Scriptures to prove that God did before all creation beget of himself a certain rational power, which by the Holy Ghost is called also the Glory of the Lord, and sometimes the Son, sometimes Wisdom, sometimes an Angel, and sometimes God, and sometimes the Lord, and the Logos or Word; and once, when he appeared to Jesus the son of Nave in the form of man, he called himself the Chief Captain; for he is called by all these names because he is subject to the counsel of the Father, and was begotten by his will, just like what we see done in ourselves: for when we speak any word, we beget that word; but not by separating it from us, so as to diminish the word that is in us, by our speaking it. In the same manner also we see that one fire made from another does really exist, but does not diminish that from which it was lighted. And the Word of Wisdom shall testify for me, who is very God, begotten of the Father of all things, and really is the Logos or Word, and Wisdom, and Power, and Glory of him that begot him, who thus spake by

Digitized by Google

by Solomon: 'The Lord created me,' etc. etc. Prov. viii. 22. A distinction in number is further implied in the words of God at the creation, 'let *us* make man!' That he, this exalted personage, was born of the virgin, take in proof the question of Isaiah, 'Who shall declare his generation?' the words of the Psalm, 'from the womb have I begotten thee,' and the whole xlvth Psalm. But you say, granting that he is begotten of the Supreme God, those who worship the God that made this person, need not adore him. To which I reply that all your observations savour more of cavils against our views than the investigations of a seeker of truth, in which I do not desire to imitate you. Without pronouncing any harsh decision respecting the men of your nation, I must nevertheless, in both charity and candour, say that those Jews who are saved, 'are saved through him, and are of his party.' The Psalms of David also predict his reign, especially Psalms xcix., lxxii., and xix., implying the duty of obedience and homage. But what, urges Trypho, is the meaning of that in Isaiah, 'I am the Lord God, that is my name: my glory will I not give to another, nor my power?' (Is. xlii. 38.) This passage is explained by the context, which says 'that God will only give his glory to him whom he had set for a light to the Gentiles, and to none other,'—not that he will reserve it to himself alone.

Resuming the topic of birth from a virgin, it is written, 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son,'—a thing never said of any except this Christ of ours. The case of Perseus, born of Danaë the virgin, from the Grecian mythology, is suggested by Trypho. These and the stories of Bacchus, Hercules, and Æsculapius—the one using wine in his mysteries, the other ascending to heaven after death, the third healing diseases—are only inventions of the devil to disparage truth, as prophecy had foretold all this of Christ so long before as the time of Isaiah. The mysteries of Mithra too, what are they but suggestions taken from Daniel? 'Bread shall be given him, and his water shall be sure.' (Isaiah xxxiii.) In this prophecy how clear is the mention of that bread which Christ hath commanded us to offer in remembrance of his being made flesh—and of that cup which he commanded those who celebrate the Eucharist to offer in remembrance of his blood. But these prophecies ye will not understand; and the translation of the seventy elders you depreciate; and from the Scriptures your rabbies have erased several passages that speak of Christ. In the xcvith Psalm has been omitted in your copies, after 'The Lord hath reigned'—from the wood or tree—*i. e.* from the cross. You say the charge is incredible, and certainly the guilt is great; nor can you specially see how this Psalm can be made to apply to Christ: nevertheless on our principles it unquestionably does.

After

Digitized by Google

After a hiatus of greater or less length—what is really lost being impossible to determine—the second day's conference begins with an abrupt citation of the passage from Deut. xxxi. 16-18, denouncing the very name of God upon the Israelites, should they prove unfaithful to the covenant of God. Justin then proceeds to affirm that the name of God not revealed to Abraham or Jacob was Jesus. Joshua was called after him. The prophets are the messengers of God, and Jesus of Nazareth was a prophet great and mighty. If God appeared in various forms to the patriarchs, why not assume the form of man, being conceived of a virgin? Daniel, too, names him 'one like the son of man' (vii. 13, 14)—not man, but like him; *i. e.* not of human extraction. To the same effect also the title, 'a stone cut out without hands' (ii. 34). Isaiah's term also, 'the angel of great counsel' (ix. 6), foretels that he should be a teacher of the designs of his Father. By his power and promise, too, we exorcise devils and all wicked spirits in accordance with his promise (Luke x. 19). He was, indeed, to suffer first, according to prophecy, but afterwards to reign; and David hath declared that as he is the Christ he is a mighty God, and to be worsbipped. Ps. xlv. 11.

Proceed now, says Trypho, to explain the passage in Isaiah which we refer to Hezekiah. First, replies Justin, allow me to prove that it cannot refer to him; for it is said, 'Before the child shall know how to say father or mother he shall take of the power of Damascus, and the spoils of Samaria before the king of the Assyrians.' This Hezekiah neither did, nor could do, while an infant, but it has been verified in Jesus; for as soon as born the wise men who came from the East went first to Herod—here called parabolically king of the Assyrians, for his covetous and cruel disposition. Damascus and Samaria are named, because the wise men came from Arabia, and revolted against all wickedness symbolized by these places ever since their worshipping Christ. Here Trypho professes respect for the word of God; but objects to Justin's explanations as 'fallacious, or rather, blasphemous,' having special regard in these terms to the Christian doctrine of the apostacy of the angels. To which Justin replies, that Isaiah declared (xxx. 1-5), 'There are in Tanais wicked angels;' Zechariah, that the devil stood at the right hand of Jesus to resist him, iii. 1, 2; that in Job it was written, 'the angels came to stand before the Lord, and that the devil came with them (i. 6; ii. 1); and in Moses, the serpent tempted Eve; while David says, 'the gods of the nations are devils' (Ps. xcvi. 5).

Do you believe, here asks Trypho, that Jerusalem is to be built again, and inhabited a thousand years, etc. etc.? and Justin affirms his faith in this dogma, though he adds, 'that there are many

Digitized by Google

many good and pious Christians who do not believe it.' For Isaiah hath spoken concerning this thousand years, lxv. 17. Psalm xc. also says, 'The day of the Lord is a thousand years; and John, one of Christ's apostles, hath foretold (Rev. xx.), that those who believe in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem; and that after that should be the universal resurrection. For the prophetical gifts once possessed by the Jews have been transferred to the Christians. The cxth Psalm is as inapplicable to Hezekiah as the prophecy of Isaiah lately explained. 'From the womb I have begotten thee before the morning star,' cannot apply to any of the sons of time. Equally does the prophecy of Isaiah forbid application to any but Christ (vii. 14); for 'Behold a virgin shall conceive,' could not be a sign if she should conceive by cohabitation: the marvel must be, that she should conceive without. Psalm xxiv. also applies exclusively to Christ, and not to Solomon nor Hezekiah. The repetitions made in the proofs are partly for the benefit of those absent from the conference yesterday, but also from a conviction of their truth. Many woods mentioned in the Old Testament were types of the cross of Christ: the tree of life in Paradise, the rod of Moses, the wood thrown into the water at Mara; Jacob's pilled rods, his walking staff, and the ladder of his vision. The God who appeared above the ladder was Christ. Christ is also the stones anointed, or otherwise mentioned in the Scriptures; according to that of Psalm xlv. 'anointed with the oil of gladness;' and the budding of Aron's rod, and a rod of the stem of Jesse, and the oak at Mamre, and the three score and ten willow trees, and the rod and the staff that comforted David (Psalm xxiii.), and the staff of Eliseus—all these relate to the same glorious person. Here Trypho asks, how the 'rod, coming forth out of the stem of Jesse,' to be endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost, is consistent with the pre-existence of Christ and his possession of those gifts in a pre-existent state. To which the reply is, that the spirit of God predicted 'to rest' upon him, means, that the gifts of the Spirit would cease in him, and he would thus be the last prophet of the nation. He did not then receive these gifts because before he had been without them; no, but as he received his baptism, at which 'a fire was lighted up in Jordan;' and the visible descent of the Spirit, and the other acts of his life for the sake of mankind, that the fallen might be restored and established in their integrity. But, says Trypho, suppose I allowed the passages you have quoted to speak of Christ, I cannot reconcile with my notions of the truth, the death of the Messiah on the cross; for it is written in the law, 'Cursed is he that is crucified!' (Deut. xxi. 23). That he was to suffer we may own, but that he was to suffer on the cross we cannot allow. You must allow,

Digitized by Google

allów, Trypho, says Justin, that much truth in Scripture is wrapped up in figures: Moses then, with extended arms over Amalek, is a type of the cross; the horns of the unicorn, in the blessing of Joseph (Deut. xxxiii. 13), likewise represent the cross; as well as the brazen serpent of Moses. But, unless the Scriptures are rightly understood by the favour of God it will seem, to the prejudiced understanding, as if God had different modes of procedure at different times—justifying some by faith and some by circumcision. Nevertheless the law of God has always been the same in effect, namely, supreme love to God, and love to one's neighbour like oneself. This latter precept those have violated who have crucified Christ; and, 'even to this very day curse those who prove that he who was crucified is, in truth, the Messiah.' And the curse pronounced in the law against every one crucified no more embraces the Messiah than the prohibition of making images condemns Moses for making the serpent in the wilderness. All that Christ endured was for our sakes, and through him even those who crucified him may find pardon. Besides, the curse predicted on every one who hangs on a tree is a prediction of what the Messiah should endure at the hands of the Jews, who curse him and his followers. That he should die and rise again is foretold by David, in the words, 'I laid me down and slept; I rose up, for the Lord sustained me' (Ps. iii. 4); by Isaiah, 'I have stretched forth my hands' (lxv. 2); 'his burying was taken away;' and 'I will give the rich for his death' (liii. 9); and by David, in Psalm xxii—this last being evidently applicable to no king and priest of the nation, for never did any such functionary die by the cross. The words in the commencement of the Psalm were those used by Christ on the cross. Passages, referring to Jacob and Israel, are also predictive of Christ in some cases, and also those calling him Son of man. Christ owns his descent from man when he says, 'Our fathers trusted in thee!' 'My hope from my mother's breasts' describes the flight into Egypt, cast upon his mother's care. 'My tongue did cleave to my jaws,' represented his silence before his judges. 'Bulls' are the doctors that caused his apprehension; and 'calves' the persons employed for that purpose. 'The roaring lion' is Herod, or the devil, called by Jesus, Satanas. 'Sata, in the Jewish or Syrian language, signifies an apostate; and "nas" is the word from which he is by interpretation called a serpent, that is, according to the signification of the word in Hebrew, out of both which words one is formed, namely Satanas or Satan.' 'All my bones are poured out like water,' means the bloody sweat in the garden of olives. 'The dogs' are the assembly of the wicked. 'They parted my garments among them,' was a prophecy literally fulfilled,

Digitized by Google

filled, as we 'find it related in the Commentaries of the Apostles.' When he prayed, 'deliver my soul from the power of the dog,' he prayed to be kept from the power of evil spirits, to which the soul in its separate condition is exposed, like Samuel to the woman of Endor. The resurrection of Christ is foretold in the end of the Psalm: 'In the midst of the congregation will I praise thee.' He changed the names of Peter, James, and John, just as he before changed the name of Jacob and of Joshua. That he was to rise on the third day is clear, from his giving as a sign to the people the prophet Jonas. But though he did rise, the Jews did not repent, like the men of Nineveh, but propagated slanders against him and his disciples, saying they stole him out of his grave. But though hated and persecuted by the Jews, his followers do not hate them in return, but rather 'pray for them that they may even now repent and obtain mercy from him, who is full of compassion and great pity, God, the creator of all things.' That the Gentiles should repent and believe upon Christ is foretold by Micah (iv. 1):—every one of us cultivating piety and humanity, 'sitting every one under his own vine,' that is, every one is contented with his own wife only; for you know very well that the prophetic writings say 'his wife shall be as a faithful vine' (Psalm cxxviii. 3). One part of the prophecy is fulfilled in the first coming, the remainder will be fulfilled at the second coming of Christ. The two goats of the day of atonement were a sign of a two-fold coming; as also Moses on the mount representing the cross, and Joshua in the field representing a conqueror. The Paschal lamb, with its blood, signified that 'the blood of Christ would deliver those that believe in him from death.' And the scarlet rope at Jericho was a type of the same thing. But these things the rabbies explain differently, and dwell upon trifling matters of no moment. They inquire why an A was added to Abraham's name, and an R to Sarah's? but not why Auses was called Jesus or Joshua, a type of Christ. He circumcised the people with knives of stone as Christ did with the precepts of his law, Christ himself being a stone, as has been proved. But some things are spoken plainly and others figuratively of Christ, neither of which will prejudice allow the Jews to understand: 'Like flies, you settle upon sores.' Zacharias prophesies concerning the Christians in the well known passage of the priest Jesus, and the devil standing to rebuke him (iii. 1, 2): this means the salvation of Christ's people from infamous habits. Malachi also foretels of the sacrifice of bread and wine to be offered acceptably by other followers of Jesus (i. 10-12). Wherefore the Jews ought even now to repent, ere the day of judgment come, when those that have pierced Christ shall be known. We Christians are the people promised to Abraham,

Digitized by Google

ham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. If the Gentiles believe upon Christ, and are blessed in him (Ps. lxxii. 17), then is Jesus the Christ and we are blessed in Him. Further, Isaiah says, 'I have made thee for a light to the Gentiles,' which the Jews falsely interpret as if spoken of them as proselytes—many considerations forbidding it. The Christians are the true Israel, which, if we be required to prove again, we assent to in order to do good and effectually convince. Christians are further the sons of God, which they may well be without offence, seeing the Psalmist calls the congregation of Israel gods (Ps. lxxxii.). The name Israel signifies a man prevailing over power; 'from Isra, a man prevailing over, and El, power.' Christ is this Israel prevailing over Satan, with whom Christ further corresponds in the numbness of death, which was typified by the numbing of Jacob, the first Israel's, thigh. Several names given to the Messiah bespeak two natures in him; the one by which he was made visible, the other divine. The visions of God to the patriarchs do not agree with God the Father, 'who does not come into any place, nor walks, nor sleeps, nor rises up;' but to him who by his will is both God his Son, and his angel or messenger.' Now that 'Christ is Lord, and God the Son of God, and by his power did formerly appear as a man, and an angel, and in the appearance of fire as in a bush, and in the judgment that was inflicted upon Sodom, has been abundantly proved by what has been said.' The Word of God is not a mere emanation, but a distinct power—distinct as the angels from their Creator—a power begotten by the will of the Father, not by division, just as 'we see several fires lighted at the same fire, and the fire from which several are lighted is not lessened at all, but continues the same.' The plurality of persons in Deity is proved by passages explained before—the transactions at Sodom, the creation, and the Wisdom of the book of Proverbs; the conversion of the Gentiles is foretold by Moses. The Gentiles who are converted are more faithful than the Jews, for whom so many miracles and deliverances were wrought—to whom so many types of this same Christ were presented, and so much good done through his name. That name led safely back the ark of witness from Azotum, drawn by young heifers, who stopped in the field of one named Auses, the same name as his who before was named Jesus (Joshua). Notwithstanding all this the Jews still refuse to believe. They also encourage themselves in evil; such, for instance, as polygamy, by the example of the patriarchs, not knowing that these were figures. Jacob's wives represent—Leah, the Jews; Rachel, the Christians. 'Leah's eyes were weak; for the eyes of your minds were very weak indeed. Rachel stole away Laban's gods, and hid them until this day: we also have forsaken our country,

Digitized by Google

country, and gods made of wood and stone. Jacob was always hated by his brother: both we and our Lord are now hated by you and by the whole race of mankind, though we are all brethren by nature. Jacob was named Israel: and it has been proved that Christ, who both really is and is called Jesus, is Israel.' And the same Christ is 'Israel your king' (Is. xliii. 15); and we are the seed of Jacob (Is. lxv. 9); nevertheless you have rejected him and persecuted us. 'But the day draws toward an end, for the sun is just ready to set; I will therefore mention but one thing more and have done.' Noah with his family, eight in number, was a type of the day on which Christ appeared from the dead, which was the eighth indeed in number, but was always the first in rank, power, and order. Christ is the author, like him, of a new race, regenerated by water, faith, and wood, just as Noah was saved by wood, sailing on water with his family. The blessings and curses pronounced by the patriarch were a prediction of things to come. The marriage of Jacob with bond-servants indicated that Christ would receive the bond and make them free, just as much as the sons of Abraham. Nor must the Jews allege, because it was foretold they should be wicked, therefore it could not be otherwise, for both men and angels were endowed with conscience and free will. But now that sin has befallen, those must repent who would partake of the mercy of God: after that of David—'Blessed is he to whom the Lord will not impute sin' (Ps. xxxii. 1). If remission was not granted to so great a person as David without repentance, how can the very impure and abandoned have any hope that, without repentance, the Lord will not impute sin to him?

'And this one fact of David's transgression with the wife of Urias proves, my friends,' said I, 'that the patriarchs did not take several wives merely to gratify their carnal appetites; but that a certain dispensation and all mysteries were to be performed by them. For if any one was permitted to take whom he would to wife, and as he would, and as many wives as he pleased (as your countrymen do who, throughout the world wherever they travel or wheresoever they are sent, take women under the name of wives), how much more would it have been lawful for David to have done so?

'"Saying this, dearest Marcus Pompeius, I concluded." "And Trypho, after a short pause, said, "You see that we had no design of entering into a discourse with you on this subject. But, as for my part, I confess I have been greatly delighted with this conference, and I believe my companions will say the same. For we have found more than we expected, or indeed could expect. But if we could have more frequent opportunities of conversing together, we should receive greater advantage still by searching the Scriptures. But because, as you said, you are just ready to depart, and expect to set sail every day, I desire, if it is not too much trouble, that when you are gone you would remember us as friends.

Digitized by Google'"So

'"So far as lies in my power," said I, "I would do that every day if I could stay; but as I expect, with God's leave, to depart soon, I exhort you that you would apply yourselves to, and consider, over and over again, this great and important subject, in which your salvation is concerned, and to endeavour to prevail upon yourselves to prefer the Christ of Almighty God before your rabbies." And so they departed, wishing me a good and prosperous voyage, and a safe deliverance from every other misfortune. And I prayed for them, and said, "I cannot wish you, gentlemen, a greater blessing than that you may by this means acknowledge that every man is endowed with understanding, and that you may steadfastly believe with us that Jesus is the Christ of God.'"

Considerable resemblance will be found between the Oration to the Greeks and the Cohortatio which follows it. We give them from Otto's edition, and place them in the order he adopts. Their genuineness may be doubted, and no probable date can be assigned for their composition. In the first of these two pieces the author appears somewhat coarse, but he is dealing with a coarse subject. They do not approach, indeed none of his works approach, the merit of his larger Apology for the Christians.

'The Oration to the Greeks.

'Λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας.

'Suppose not, Greeks, that without reason I am estranged from your ways and worship, for nothing in them have I found sacred or acceptable to God. The writings of your poets are monuments of human passion and folly. Agamemnon, to redeem the worthless wife of his brother, carried off by a paltry shepherd,[i] consents that his own daughter should be put to death: quarrels with Achilles about another silly woman: while the great hero himself, the conqueror of Troy, in his turn becomes captive to Polyxena. Ulysses earned a name for goodness and prudence which he did not deserve. Telamonian Ajax goes mad on insufficient cause. The fables of Homer I value not—their beginning and end is woman. The Theogony of Hesiod is no better. Saturn usurps the throne of his father, and Jupiter does the same by Saturn, and divides the empire of the universe with Neptune and Pluto; and Pluto ravishes Proserpina, and Neptune Melanippa and the Nereids, and Jupiter Antiope, as a satyr, Danae as gold, Europa as a bull, and Leda as a swan, and Semele and Ganymede prove his impurity and wake the jealousy of his wife. Apollo, the prophet, was a liar, Minerva a virago, Bacchus effeminate, Venus a courtezan. Read over to Jupiter the laws against disrespect to parents and against adultery; to Minerva and Diana, those prescribing female duties to females; to Bacchus, those for men. Look at your Hercules and his labours, and his loves, and his being shamefully whipped[k] by Lyde, and his death by his own hand. Vulcan's well-grounded

[i] λεπροῦ ποιμένος, a scabby shepherd, more expressive than courteous.

[k] κατὰ γλουτῶν τυπτόμενος.

Digitized by Google

jealousy too, shows what your gods are, and your heroes are made manifest in their histories—Atreus, Thyestes, the Pelopidæ, Procne and her sister, Laius and Œdipus. Your solemn feasts, too, my soul abhors; extravagant, luxurious, inciting to every ill, inducing a Bacchic furor in the mind, and ending in the grossest impurities. How can you quarrel with son or wife, or neighbour, when they only do, in injuring your honour, person, or property, what Jupiter or Venus have done, whom you worship? Learn then, in future, the incomparable wisdom and divine words of truth. For our Commander, the divine Logos, who continually presides over us, does not demand of us strength of body nor beauty of feature, nor a lordly spirit, but a pure mind, guarded by holiness and divine actions. This raises us above Olympus itself, to heaven and immortal life. Approach and learn this heavenly doctrine and be as I am, for I was once as ye are now. The peace of God will then possess your soul—freed from lust, enormities, brawls, and passions, which disturb the repose of the unconverted mind.'

We next introduce the piece generally known under the title of the 'EXHORTATION TO THE GREEKS' [Λόγος παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας], although we think the objections to its genuineness are enough to cast serious doubts upon its authorship. But our purpose is not critical—to impugn or defend the text of this work—rather to put our readers in possession of its substance, premising, in order to make it more intelligible, that whereas the two preceding publications are apologetic and defensive, this carries the war into the enemy's camp, and seeks to overturn at once the Hellenic philosophy and religion. This mode of procedure was perfectly competent for the author to adopt, and all things besides being congruous, would form no objection to Justin's authorship of this work, but, taken in conjunction with other discrepancies, justifies the very strong suspicions we entertain that it never proceeded from the pen of this Father, although it no doubt represents the mode of attack upon paganism which prevailed in his day.

The author, whoever he may have been, commences his work by desiring of God help for himself in stating, and candour on the part of the Greeks whom he addresses, in judging the argument entered upon: the topic being one of the highest importance in the esteem alike of inspired prophets on the one hand, and the leading minds among the heathen on the other. The first persons who are selected for censure are the poets, because of their ridiculous theogonies; Homer, for instance, ascribing the original of the gods to water, making them arbiters of war; Jupiter, guilty of perjury, a helpless tool in the hands of Fate, unable to defend himself on a memorable occasion from outrage by the other gods, given over to many impure loves; Mars, Venus, Juno, and Pluto, wounded by mortals, and the God of War once bound by giants for

Digitized by Google

for thirteen months; the gods, too, all at variance with each other. And Hesiod writes to the same effect:—

'But perhaps,' continues the writer, 'you will disown the gods whom the poets fashion for you; let us then examine the doctrine of the philosophers themselves, which is only more ridiculous still. To begin with Thales the Milesian, he averred that water was the origin of the universe, and water would be the end. Next, Anaximander, also a Milesian, said that infinity was the beginning and end of all things. But a third Milesian, Anaximenes, averred that all things were formed of air, and would terminate in the same. Heraclitus, on the other hand, the Metapontian, alleged that fire was the author and end of all things. Anaxagoras of Clazomene maintained that the principles of all things were *equalities!* Archelaus, the Athenian, that the boundless air, and the density and rarity round it were the origin of all things. Pythagoras the Samian said that numbers and their proportions and harmonies and the monad and indefinite duad, were the first principles of the universe. Epicurus the Athenian, that bodies apprehensible by reason, solid, incorruptible, etc., were the elements of things. Empedocles the Agrigentine allowed that there were four elements—fire, air, water, earth—and two principal powers, union and discord. These are your other teachers—as contrarious and contradictory as the poets. Who would be safe in listening to them who agree not between themselves? But Aristotle and Plato ye will set up as the teachers whom ye will follow, as these are alleged to have taught the true and perfect faith. But these are as far from agreement with each other as the philosophers mentioned before: for instance, Plato declares the Supreme God to exist in the fiery essence; but Aristotle, while combating this view, asserts that Deity forms for himself a fifth ætherial and unchangeable body, and in this exists, availing himself of a verse in Homer that seems to speak this sense. Yet this same Aristotle denies Homer any weight when quoted against himself—then the blind bard is a mere poet and dealer in fiction, a verser, but by no means a philosopher. But Plato and Aristotle have scarcely two opinions alike, their whole systems being apart at almost every point. How then can ye take as guides teachers who cannot agree? How much more fitting that ye came to our teachers who lived long before these philosophers, who delivered not their own opinions, nor differed with each other, but, free from contention, taught the truth of God. They could not have attained their sublime knowledge by human efforts, but, like the lyre stricken by the hand, they communicate to us the promptings of a divine teacher. With the most perfect consent, therefore, these inform us of God, the creation of the world, the formation of man, of the immortality of the soul, of the judgment after death, and of all that it is most essential for man to know. Of these inspired teachers I will first mention Moses, who, according to your own histories, far preceded in antiquity, as in reputation, your own poets, historians, philosophers, or legislators. In the times of Inachus and Ogyges, the earliest of Greece, your Grecian records report Moses to have lived, the prince and leader of the Jewish

Digitized by Google

people. Polemon, in his Hellenic histories, and Apion against the Jews, describe the Exodus under Amasis, king of Egypt, and Ptolemy Mendesius concurs with them in this. Hellanicus and Philochorus, also, Castor, Thallus, and Polyhistor, Philo and Josephus, all mention Moses, as a very ancient prince of the Hebrews. The very title of Josephus' book intimates the earliness of the events he records, "The Antiquities of the Jews!" Diodorus, that distinguished historian and traveller, gleaned in Egypt information to the same effect. Moses was the chief doctor of the Jews, and endowed with that divine and prophetic spirit vouchsafed from heaven to holy men: and him the prophets followed in succession; the divinely taught authors of our faith and worship. But ye have none from whom to derive aught divine, except poets and philosophers—confessedly absurd, contraditory, and mistaken—and then, forsooth, you betake yourselves to oracles. Of the worth of these we have somewhat now to urge. Your own historians say that one consulting the oracle once for an answer to the question, who were the most religious of men? the reply was this:—

> Of mortals, Jews alone are truly wise,
> Honouring the Eternal Ruler of the skies.

'Thus your own oracles are on our side. Compare the remoteness of Moses' period and that of your philosophers. Socrates was the teacher of Plato, and Plato of Aristotle, these last being contemporaries of Philip and Alexander of Macedon, and of the Athenian orators, Demosthenes and Æschines. Besides, none of your histories embrace the period before the Olympiads, but the history of Moses, in Hebrew characters, was even then extant. Greek letters are ascribed to Cadmus, as an introduction by him from Phœnicia, at a period considerably later than their invention in that country; and Plato introduces Solon in one of his Dialogues, as saying he heard an Egyptian style the Greeks boys and youths, in comparison with the older nations, on the score of literature and national history. Now, all your poetry, philosophy, and every other kind of erudition, is posterior to your acquisition of the Greek character, but the Mosaic writings were given to the world in a different and earlier character, of which this circumstance is proof, namely, that when Ptolemy king of Egypt would establish his library at Alexandria, he would have these books of the Jews translated, which was done, with miraculous concert and uniformity, by seventy interpreters, kept in seventy cells till the task was done. Now "this we report to you, not as fable or mere entertaining story to serve a purpose, but when ourselves at Alexandria we saw the remains of the cells at Pharos, and were told the circumstances by the inhabitants as they had received them by general tradition, a report supported, moreover, by those trustworthy historians, Philo and Josephus." Nor should any object to us that these books belong to the Jews rather than to us, for they are ours also, and providentially preserved by the Jews rather than by us, for in controversy with that people, we allege the books preserved in their synagogues as our justification. Ye Greeks should

Digitized by Google

should then, directed as ye are by authorities both within and without, yield to no foregone error, however sanctioned, but examine all things for yourselves. Many of your own writers, especially any who have gone to Egypt, have learned to speak otherwise of Moses than they had been wont before that period of this extraordinary man; Diodorus, for instance, Orpheus, Homer, Solon, Pythagoras, Plato, and others. Orpheus, once a polytheist, proclaims the unity of God, and the Voice that proceeds out of his mouth as sharing in his rule. This αὐδή, or voice, is the λόγος, or word of God, by whom he made all worlds; the one word being substituted for the other for the metre's sake. To the Sibyl, whom Plato and Aristophanes acknowledge to be a prophetess, the same sentiments are ascribed. Even Homer, the polytheist and plagiarist of Orpheus, lets fall a seeming acknowledgment of the unity of God in the verse:—

> Though *God himself* should promise me to live
> A life untouched by age, of strength and bloom.

The same seems implied in that of Nestor:—

> A host of rulers is not safe—but since
> We must have rule, let one alone be prince.

Sophocles also avers the unity of God. Pythagoras clearly in his Monad, and Plato covertly, for fear of popular dislike, in his Timæus, a theological piece, and elsewhere. Homer in his Golden Chain, and in his expression about Hector, "Full of Jove he fears neither gods nor men," recognizes the same truth; but Plato is very inconsistent, quarrelling with Homer about his representations of the gods, his own being in some respects no better, urged probably to these by fear of persecution, and only in a covert way proclaiming the great truth he alleges from Moses. Afraid to quote from this author by name, he says, "God, as says *the ancient word*, is the beginning, end, and middle of all things," and refers to the prophets in the phrase, "those men who are dear to God." He hints at a future judgment in his first Book of the Republic, in the tenth Book of which he clearly teaches the judgment from the vision of Eris, restored to life after his decease. In this vision our doctrine of the resurrection is implied, because souls could not be punished without bodies. The Tityus, Sisiphus, and Tantalus of Homer, all are facts to the same effect, the source of these representations being Egypt, whence Homer drew his better theology directly. His Shield of Achilles records the work of God in creation in terms drawn from Moses; his Garden of Alcinous is the Garden of Eden; the attempt of Otus and Ephialtes to scale heaven is from the Jewish Scriptures; the expulsion of the devil from the upper world is imagined in that of Ate from the society of the gods. Plato's idea is but the form or pattern which Moses was to follow in the construction of the ark and tabernacle, and the form after which God fashioned the world. Jupiter traversing heaven in his rapid car is taken from our God riding on the wings of cherubim. When Plato, in his Meno, speaks of virtue being a divine gift, he means the Holy Spirit, of whom he read in the prophets; for as

Digitized by Google

as they resolved the Spirit into seven parts, so he virtue into four. He alleges also that time began with the creation and will end with it, whence but from Moses. Even idolatry finds its models of divinity in the words of Moses, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness!" But why mention these things? Simply that the Greeks may turn to the older, truer historians, who plainly speak the teachings of heaven, and not to the works of sophists and moderns, whose best is taken from the works we revere. The wisest of your philosophers, Socrates, owned he knew nothing, but these profess to know even the things of heaven. Aristotle averred God to be some fifth element of the universe, and won the belief of many, yet could not understand the tides of Euripus. Let none prefer, then, the eloquence of such teachers before his own salvation, but heed their teachings only as much as those heeded the Sirens who listened to their song with well-guarded ears. Should any reluctance to recant, to own your ignorance or abandon your superstition, lead you to reject the inspired teachers themselves, at least listen to Orpheus and others proclaiming the oneness of God. The Babylonian Sibyl, too, the daughter of Berosus the Chaldean, teaches doctrines divinely like those of the prophets. At Cumæ we ourselves saw the throne of rock from which she uttered her oracles, the font in which she bathed, the recess in which she hid. Plato, in his Meno, testifies to the divine inspiration of such persons. Our guides informed us also that a brazen chest was in the keeping of the inhabitants of the place containing her remains. She testifies in express terms to the advent of Jesus Christ our Saviour. But as your very philosophers own that of God nothing can be known, that he is *πάνκρυφον*, altogether hidden, leave their teaching for that of those who by divine inspiration will infallibly teach you about the true God, and the true religion, the prophets of the Most High.'

The Fragment on the Resurrection has been preserved in the Sacred Parallels of St. John Damascenus, and was first published in Latin in the works of that saint (Paris, 1619, folio). It was shortly afterwards transferred (in 1622) into an edition of the works of Justin Martyr, published at Douay by Peter Halloix. Grabe edited it in his *Spicilegium* (Oxford, 1700); and we find that it has appeared in English by Humphreys (London, 1714), although we have never fallen in with it. The leading thoughts in this fragment will be found in our *resumé* which follows:—

'Fragment on the Resurrection.

''Εκ τοῦ περὶ ἀναστάσεως.

'The word of truth is free and independent, and ought to be believed, not questioned. But as it is divine, so also is it free from arrogance. Nevertheless, to demand demonstration of matters of faith were about as reasonable as to demand demonstration of objects present to the senses. We do not then demonstrate truth but believe it; and truth is God, the Father of the universe, who is perfect mind: whose son, the Logos, came to us, being incarnate, showing us the Father and the Son,

Digitized by Google

Son, and bestowing the resurrection of the dead in himself, and afterwards eternal life. As the faith of these things is impugned by the adversary, we deem it right to launch the invincible weapons of truth at him in return.

'The enemies of righteousness say that a resurrection is impossible, the parts being dissolved and scattered. They frame certain sophisms to this effect: either the body will rise perfect or imperfect; if imperfect, it will convict Deity of defect of power; if perfect, how absurd to say that man will not marry in heaven. Some say Christ's advent was spiritual, and not in the flesh, implying that the resurrection is spiritual. These things we explain on this wise. That men and women should marry in another life, is not necessary; for we see even in the present life, certain women barren, others vow perpetual virginity, and holy men preserve their chastity intact, or dissolve their nuptial bond. Certain animals, as mules, also do not generate, though the proper organs are possessed by them. Our Lord Jesus Christ was born of a virgin, at once to check the indulgence of carnal desires, and to show that God could produce man without recourse to human means. He lived embracing the ordinary conditions of human life, indulging in food, drink, and clothing, but avoiding marriage, which is not a necessary condition. The body without food dies, but this other abstinence inflicts no ill. Christ positively foretold also that this relation of the sexes should cease in the future world. "The children of this world marry and are given in marriage, but the children of the future world will neither marry nor give in marriage, but be as the angels of God."

'But, say the opponents, if men rise as they died, the one-eyed will rise with one eye—the lame, lame—and so with any other defect. How blind in heart are they who urge this objection! For Christ restored the members of the maimed by miracle on earth, not only to fulfil prophecy, "the blind see and the deaf hear," but also to induce belief in the resurrection of the body. If bodies were restored whole in life, how much more after death.

'But others add, in the way of objection, that the resurrection is impossible—infidels these, in fact, and even more infidel than the infidels; for Homer the pagan could say—

'The gods with ease can all things do.'

If the Gods of the heathen are believed to have this power, and they are only demons, how much more God who made the first man (*τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου*) out of clay, and exhibits his power continually in the reproduction of man by means seemingly so incredible (*ἐξ ἐλαχίστης βανίδος ὑγροῦ*). But as we are about to adduce other arguments in favour of the resurrection of the body, we must crave the indulgence of believers if we borrow them from the world and sources extraneous to things divine.

'The heathen philosophers, then, assert that the universe is matter and God, as Plato—that atoms and a vacuum, as Epicurus—that fire, water, air, earth is, as the Stoics. Whatever differences these sages professed, they help these two things in common, that what exists neither

Digitized by Google

neither came from nothing, nor dissolves into nothing—and that the elements from which all things are made are imperishable. According to Plato's views, then, God and matter being both indestructible, to renew the body in its former shape will be as easy as for a moulder of waxen figures to renew the shape after breaking up any figure he has made. If we adopt the Stoic opinion, to bring together the four elements again, after their separation, in the same proportion and rhythm as they existed before, is all that is necessary to the restoration of the human body. According to Epicurus, since the atoms and vacuum are indestructible, the atoms need but again resume their previous order and arrangement (*θέσιν καὶ τάξιν*) to be all they were before, just as the mosaic-worker constructs his damaged figure of an animal out of his old materials. On the principles of the heathen, then, cannot God restore the human body by a resurrection?

'But, say some, the body is too vile to deserve a resurrection; as if that could be vile which was made by God after his own image. But the body is unworthy, forsooth, because it is sinful and constrains the soul to sin; just as if it were the sole sinner, and should bear the burden of both. On the contrary, the body would not have sinned at all had not the soul led the way. As, in ploughing, no single ox can do the work, so body and soul are accomplices in sin. But, granting that the body alone did sin, then it was the special object of our Saviour's advent, for he says, "I came not to call the just, but sinners to repentance." But now must we address a word to the objection, that however dear we might allow the flesh to be to the Almighty, there is, nevertheless, no promise of its resurrection. How absurd and unworthy of God to suppose he takes less interest in his creature than the artist in his work. God the incorruptible is not such a one as this supposition would imply: the great mind of the universe could not act so absurdly. He has promised resurrection and eternal life to the body, in promising salvation to man; for man consists of body as well as soul. The soul alone is not the man, nor the body alone, but both: to save the one and not the other would not fulfil the promise. Both the soul and body heard the glad tidings of salvation, and both must share the boon. But the soul, say they, is incorruptible, an emanation of God; but the flesh is corruptible, and not of the nature of God. Where is the power and goodness of God, we say in reply to this—power to save from death what cannot die—goodness in saving that which is part of himself, which any one would do, which nature prompts the very brute to?

* * * * * * *

If the body were of no worth, why did Christ heal it? and, strangest of all, raise it from the dead? Christ's own resurrection is proof of the body's rising; for he bore the same body after death which had been crucified. That bodies can rise to heaven he proved by his ascension afterwards. None but an obstinate Sadducean could ask for clearer demonstrations of the resurrection of the dead.

* * * * * * *

The resurrection, in fact, must be of the flesh, because the flesh dies, the

Digitized by Google

the soul does not die. The soul is in the body while the body lives, but when the soul departs the body dies. Now if the Saviour had only promised life to the soul, what more had he done than Pythagoras, Plato, and their band of followers? But now something novel and far exceeding their highest reach of thought, is promised us, namely, not that God will endow incorruption with incorruptibility, but the corruptible with incorruption. But the prince of darkness has spread damnable heresies by means of his emissaries who crucified the Lord of glory, and hath brought down blasphemies upon the name they presumptuously bore, while in deeds they denied it. If, in fact, the body rise not again, wherefore do we refrain from the indulgences after which it craves, and not like the desperate sick, whom no simples can save, live as we please? But Christ, our great physician, has enjoined a sober and continent life, that our body may be deemed worthy to share in the resurrection, and be kept from sin, just as prudent doctors forbid certain indulgences to their patients so long as there is any hope of their restoration to health.'

After the full analysis presented here, it may seem almost superfluous to volunteer observation upon the works presented in brief; but we must not allow the dialogue with Trypho to pass from under our notice without a cursory remark or two, because it is the principal production of the writer, and more frequently than any other referred to in controversy. We cannot but observe, in the first place, and while we observe object to, the view presented by Justin of the period of the institution of the Sabbath, and the reason of it, that it was a Mosaic ordinance imposed upon the people as a yoke and punishment with a special view to control their tendency to idolatry, and not observed by the patriarchs who lived before the exode, Abel, Enoch, Lot, Noah, Melchizedek, etc. We certainly have read the Old Testament records with very different eyes from those of this philosophic Father upon the point just noted, for we have arrived at conclusions the very reverse of his, our conviction being that from the creation of man upon the earth a seventh day Sabbath was observed—that it was part and parcel of the heritage of the first man and all his family—a fruit of God's benevolence to the race, and neither the privilege nor restriction of the Jews alone.

In connection with this stands the question of circumcision, which is invariably represented to be a rite imposed as a burden, a pain and a disgrace, designed to mark the Jews out for persecution at the hands of those nations which were uncircumcised, and by no means a token of the favour of God. Such a view is wholly opposed to the most obvious view of the rite as given in the terms of its institution. 'And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am Almighty God; walk before me and be thou perfect, and I will

Digitized by Google

will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly.' 'Behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.' 'And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God. Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised.' 'Then Abraham fell upon his face and laughed.' 'And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house, and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the self same day as God had said unto him. And Abraham was ninety years old and nine when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin' (Gen. xvii. 1, 2. 4. 7, 8. 17. 23, 24). This simple and straightforward narrative, which the strain of Justin's remarks would almost lead one to believe he had never read, is quite sufficient to overturn his representation of the matter. Circumcision was the sign manual and seal appended to the writing of the covenant, whereby all its blessings were made over to those who owned the faith and bore this conditioned badge of Abraham. In no one of its aspects could it be regarded as a penalty, but a privilege: in no sense a Cain-like mark for recognition and retribution, rather a Joseph's coat, the expression and the pledge of an unchanging love.

Our last observation will dwell the briefest possible space upon the intolerable tautology of the work. In the process of reducing it to the compass of our analysis this feature of it became painfully prominent, and however much we sought to avoid its disgustful exhibition in this short paper, we have not been altogether successful in its exclusion. Not that we would have so shut it out that a correct idea of the original could not be gleaned from our labours, but have given only so much of it as might indicate its existence there without perpetually recurring to interrupt the onward flow of the argument. Yet this we found impossible, and beg our readers to give us credit for greatly improving the dialogue in this particular by abbreviation, and sparing them the iteration thrice reiterate of arguments and illustrations which had already figured to some purpose before in the work. The treatment of Trypho in the dialogue, too, whether a mere man of straw—an ecclesiastical Guy Fawkes meant to be roasted—or

Digitized by Google an

an actual personage, is the reverse of courteous and Christian. Justin speaks of the Jews with the tone of a man whose temper had been soured by the ill treatment the Christians had been long used to receive from that nation, and can scarcely at times observe common decency when alluding to the circumstance. To the most natural objections, urged in the most gentle way by his opponent, he answers with a heat of spirit, and sometimes with a licence of invective, little creditable to the good father's self-control and discretion. Trypho appears pliable and amiable to an extreme degree, and expresses his satisfaction with arguments and statements very far from satisfactory to us. This goes far, along with other facts, to make us doubt the actuality of the conference which the dialogue records, and invests it with a character to our observation transparently mythic. If the arguments employed in this work were the best and choicest the Christians could employ in controversy with their most subtle adversaries, and there is certainly every reason to believe such to be the case—for this dialogue with Trypho has ever been regarded as one of the golden remains of the literature of the early church—then have we stronger ground than ever to believe in the miraculous and divine promulgation of Christianity. The confession of the inspired must have been pre-eminently that of the uninspired teachers of the Gospel during the first century or two:—'we have this treasure in earthen vessels that the excellency of the power may be of God.'

The Apology presented to the Roman emperors we consider a much more respectable production as to method, style, and logical coherence. If any thing, in our apprehension, might have been supposed to justify the Jew in his unbelief, it would be the arguments employed by Justin to beat him out of it, more adapted in every case to answer the cavils of a child than to satisfy a masculine understanding. Our judgment may seem severe, but it is according to truth.

The theological views of our author upon the subject of baptismal regeneration in the Apology are essentially wrong, and altogether unscriptural. Regeneration by water he blurts out without the least suspicion of error in the dogma or reserve in the statement. Nor can we acquit him of stating in so many words that the elements of the Lord's Supper are 'the flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus.'[m] On the Millennium his doctrine is unsound; and, with the great multitude of the early Christians, he constantly ascribes almost every evil prevalent in the Church and the

[m] ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι.—Apol. I. p. 98

world

Digitized by Google

world to the agency of evil angels and demons. These had fallen by intercourse with women, according to that universally misconceived passage in Gen. vi. 1, and employed all their art and power in perverting the Gospel and ruining the world. Much that is advanced upon this head is absurd and puerile in the highest degree, and the possession by demons of the bodies of men in Justin's days, and the boasted faculty of exorcism, are entitled to about an equal degree of belief. Equally credulous with too many of his time he cites a spurious work, the Acts of Pilate,[n] with a degree of deference for its authority only due to a canonical composition: and is a sad blunderer in his chronology,[o] making Ptolemy, under whom the version of the Seventy was made, a contemporary of Herod the king of Judea. In his Apology he also describes the statue of Semo Sancus, the Sabine deity at Rome, as one to the honour of Simon Magus, a point generally given against him by his editors, he having read 'Simoni Deo Sancto,' instead of 'Semoni Sanco Deo.' It is by no means improbable that the inscription has been the parent of the tradition respecting the presence of the heretic Simon in Rome and the veneration with which he was regarded there, for a name has originated a legend perhaps quite as frequently as a legend a name.

The evidence of Justin has been more frequently appealed to on the subject of the divinity of Christ than upon the subjects of the cultus and even sacraments of the early church, a procedure justified by the superior importance of the doctrine. On this question, fortunately, the evidence is neither scanty nor doubtful, and we are happy to avow our confident belief in the essential agreement of Justin's views with those of the great body of believers in all ages. There is no fair reason to call in question the unwavering orthodoxy of this ancient and very influential doctor of the church, nor to look upon the decided expression of his own views upon this vital article of faith as any other than an honest reflection of the prevailing forms of belief among the Christians in his day. He repeatedly designates the Messiah and Saviour of the world God, in the most unqualified manner: Θεὸς ὑπάρχει, He is God (Apol. i. 96); οὗτος αὐτὸς Θεὸς ὢν, The same being himself God (Dial. 282); Ἄγγελος Θεὸς ὑπάρχων, The Angel being God (p. 283); Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, Of God and Christ (p. 343); Ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, The God of God (p. 345); Θεὸς Θεοῦ υἱός, God the Son of God (p. 357).

There can be no doubt then, based upon tenable ground, that he desired to maintain, and did personally hold, the essential divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ; but the vice of philosophising

[n] Apol. I. pp. 76. 84.

[o] Apol. I. p. 72.

Digitized by Google upon

upon the relation of the Logos to the unbegotten and ineffable God—as he calls the Father repeatedly in his works—led to the employment of terms and illustrations which partially militate against this view. These can be explained for the most part as resulting from the position of Christ in the economy of redemption, but their introduction at all is to be traced, we believe, to the obtuseness and feebleness of Justin's mind, who could not see that his arguments were not sufficiently robust to sustain his thesis, that his illustrations obscured the very point they were designed to prove. He was not wise enough to perceive how here he was but darkening counsel, a want of perspicacity he has shared with a host of speculative divines since his day. In a pre-eminent degree, however, we ascribe this fault to Justin, or we should scarcely have deemed ourselves justified in particularising it. There is a confusion also in his expressions about the influence of the Logos on the minds of the better heathen sages previous to the introduction of Christianity (*Apol.* I. 82) which, did we not charitably attribute to indistinctness of perception, would make us doubt whether he held in that particular paragraph any objective Christ at all. His doctrine here is benevolent, that all who lived before the incarnation according to their reason were in fact Christians, though in seeming heathens, and is so far acceptable to benevolent minds, but more creditable nevertheless to the heart of our Apologist than to his reasoning faculty. We confess that on the ground of ratiocinative power we rate him low, yet on this undoubtedly the philosopher would have staked his reputation, as it is on this he evidently constructed his writings, just like an estimable friend of ours, who, when commended for any of his great gifts and attainments—and he has many—replies, 'but you should hear me whistle,' though all his friends know that he has so little ear for music, and in his vocal organs so little tune, that the attempt were enough to drive Apollo mad.

A similar want of discrimination to that we have reflected on above marks his confusion at times of the agency, if not of the personality, of the Logos and the divine spirit (*Dial.* pp. 242, 249, 268, 271-7, 268, 284, 314, 370).

Among the faults of Justin must be named his sins of omission, the dwelling so little in the course of his publications upon the cardinal doctrine of the atonement and vicarious sacrifice of the Son of God; and his omission of reference to the Epistles of St. Paul, where this doctrine shines out of every page, the light which absorbs the rest in its blaze. We have seen no commentary that explains this phenomenon, why the Gospels should be so often quoted, as the Memorials of the Apostles, and yet the most voluminous

Digitized by Google

luminous and authentic writings of the chief of the apostles, thick sown with divine truth and radiant with developed wisdom, should have been passed in silence by, nor have we any hypothesis of our own to propose in order to account for it: to us it is simply strange and unaccountable.

We greatly desiderate the power to transfer to paper a correct copy of our view of Justin's merits as a writer, and almost hesitate about undertaking the task. We fear to do a prejudice to one whom we desire to respect, and whom, all things considered, we cannot but respect. But if the term writing be understood to embrace all the merits of composition, sound matter, logical arrangement, ratiocinative power, as well as appropriate language and a good style, we cannot accord a very high position on the scale of authorship to Justin. His argumentation, sooth to say, is feeble, his iteration wearisome, his matter commonplace, his treatment jejune. But as with minds of very ordinary calibre is common, there is an excitability and semblance of emotion, partly the result of earnestness and partly of shallowness, like the brook which is noisy in proportion to the lowness of its waters, that goes far with many to redeem the author's reputation from utter contempt. It is true this warmth of manner is some merit, but it is usually inseparable from the mediocre order of mind of which alone Justin can make boast. While the whole landscape lies in majestic repose, basking at full length in the light of the sun, impressing you with the awe you would feel at falling in with a giant asleep, there is one object that does not rest, but busily, fussily, fruitlessly keeps bustling on, although its exertion issues in no progress—the windmill with its revolving sails. Compared with the massive strength, composed power, impressive sedateness of other writers, we think this no inapt similitude of Justin's energetic feebleness and needless excitement. A pagan scholar of fourth-rate capacity, Christianity seems to have bettered him into an earnest believer and simple-minded saint; but while the process put a new edge upon his zeal, it did not anneal the dull metal into stuff of a superior quality.

His Greek, while his own vernacular, is not of a very high order of purity, generally easy enough of comprehension, yet wanting syntactical accuracy, exhibiting unusual turns and constructions, and winding its tedious way through long and tortuous periods. The era in which Justin lived and wrote was a dreary middle age of Christian authorship, as far removed, it would seem, from the transparent clearness of style and doctrinal sobriety and fervour of the inspired writers, and the Roman Clement's First Epistle, as from the voluble, majestic eloquence of Chrysostom and the fanciful redundance of the Syrian Ephræm. The Church

was

Digitized by Google

was in an unhappy condition; persecution had thinned its ranks and depressed its energies, and deterred from its alliance men of influential talents and position, and in part had cooled its love, but had not very seriously deteriorated its morals. This last, in fact, is rarely the effect of persecution, as the painful process whereby it reduces the numbers of the adherents of any faith acts usually upon the unsound members first, and the weaker branches and outlying tendrils wither, thereby only to concentre the vital power within more narrow bounds. In such a condition, however, of comparative poverty of numbers and ability, any man with the gift of authorship might easily secure to himself a reputation beyond his deserts, respect heightening to admiration of the moral courage that dared to link itself with the weaker party and advocate the unpopular cause. The fame of Justin appears to have grown under circumstances like these. With the Greek writers he seems to have had a pretty extensive acquaintance, as we judge from his references to Orpheus, Homer, Sophocles, and the philosophers named in his Apology and Exhortation to the Greeks; but as it is never the province of the seed to fertilize the soil, we are not surprised to find all this seed pass into the soil of his mind, and shoot up again, without contributing much to its value or testifying strikingly to its native fertility. Can the force of absurdity and fanaticism combined much further go than to draw from Homer an acknowledgment of the Unity of the Godhead in the verse put in the mouth of one of his heroes—

'The rule of many is not good—let one be prince.'

The folly of such a proof is so extreme that we must sustain our charge by a quotation—τὴν ἑαυτοῦ περὶ ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου Θεοῦ σαφῶς καὶ φανερῶς[p] ἐκτίθεται δόξαν, πῇ μὲν .... διὰ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως, πρὸς τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος οὕτω λέγων—

Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη· εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω.

Of the Hebrew language he knew nothing, an assertion amply sustained by his ridiculous etymologies of the few Hebrew words he attempts to analyze, such as Satanas and Israel in the Trypho; but further still, and much more convincingly, by his not availing himself of the Hebrew Scriptures in the argument with this Jewish unbeliever. His appeal is made throughout to the translation of the Seventy, which he seems to regard as a kind of second inspired original, bowing to its authority and resting on its support even where manifestly at variance with the Hebrew text. How singu-

[p] We may observe here that Justin is partial to this combination; it is one of his peculiarities of phrase. Σαφῶς καὶ φανερῶς, *clearly and plainly*, we have observed to occur repeatedly in conjunction.

larly

Digitized by Google

larly this circumstance supplements the argument of the learned Neapolitan jurist Diodati in his Essay, *De Christo Græce loquente*,[q] will be obvious to every reader. Here is a person born in the midst of a Syrian population, in the very heart of the country, where, if anywhere, the native tongue might be expected to survive, yet only one hundred or one hundred and twenty years elapsed from the death of Christ, and a native living on the spot to manhood never hears one word of it; for had he known Syriac he could have been at no loss to interpret Hebrew. Now it is important to observe that no Greek colonies were founded in Palestine after the birth of our Lord, the country being at that time subject to the Roman empire, while the Grecian empire had been long subverted, so that the prevalence of Greek at the period of which we speak is *pro tanto* proof that it prevailed at the earlier period of our Lord's sojourn upon earth. Nothing can be more certain than the facts, nothing more fair than the conclusion. Justin's ignorance is more persuasive than his positive testimony on the point in hand.

Justin did not know Hebrew; but had he known Syriac, he would have known Hebrew; *ergo*, Justin did not know Syriac. The reason undoubtedly was that, the country having been subject for some centuries to Grecian influence and control, conquered by Grecian armies, settled by Grecian colonies, pervaded by Grecian commerce, adorned by Grecian art, and imbued with Grecian science and literature, was so thoroughly saturated with the Grecian language, that through all the extent of Palestine the native tongue was to a great degree superseded by that of the invader, the combined beauty and power of the importation more than compensating for the unintended wrong.

In fine Justin Martyr was a man of considerable learning, unquestionable integrity, and heroic moral courage, who had no hesitation, when duty bade him interfere, to apologise before heathen kings and persecuting magistrates for his suffering Christian brethren. But these were his crowning merits. If his writings had any good effect in those days in extinguishing the fires of martyrdom and creating a respect for Christianity in bosoms hitherto void of that feeling, they have fulfilled their mission, and we rejoice in their success; but for the present age their utility is narrowed to being evidence of the state of worship and belief prevalent among the churches of the second century. They show us that all the essentials of revelation were held much as we hold them now, but they as unmistakeably show that much was

[q] This extremely rare Essay has been reprinted by the Rev. O. T. Dobbin, LL.D., T.C.D. Gladding, City-road, London.

beginning

Digitized by Google

beginning to be held for which there was no authority in the apostolical writings. There was still simplicity of worship.[r] On this point the testimony of Justin is clear and repeated, and still and always an emphatic assertion of the proper substantive deity of Christ; but on sundry topics, the doctrines of demons and angels, the millennium, and the efficacy of sacraments, and in the fearful system of analogising and allegorising, pouring in in full flood over the schools of the Church, is an incipient departure from the soundness and simplicity of Scripture teaching. The piety of the present day will derive little edification from Justin's writings, which are all polemic; and the controversies of the present day as little from his tactics, which were calculated for a different order of things than that in which our lot is cast. The unchristian philosophy of the present day must be met by a purer philosophy, the learning by a greater learning, the anti-Scriptural sciolism by assiduous Scripture inculcation. Not a Justin, nor a Jerome, nor a Chrysostom, nor an Augustine, nor any light of the ancient Church, nor a Nicene Christianity, nor an effete ritualism, nor a gorgeous architecture, nor an authoritative dogma, nor a superannuated tradition, nor a pretentious scholasticism, nor an argumentation economic or fair, nor a reliance upon the temporal arm, no weapon, in fact, of the early or later Church will serve our turn to any purpose now but the divine doctrine which has underlaid all the errors, incrustations, and follies of that church, and has survived them all—the truth as it is in Jesus—the redemption of the world by God's anointed Son.

When Philosophy has done its worst against the ark of revealed truth, and Philosophy its best in its defence, the sword of the Spirit will still remain our most effectual weapon for the war and equipment for the field. Tried in many a perilous encounter, proven of invulnerable temper, and victor in every strife, the Christian champion cannot do better than make it his chief resource in future engagements, saying, with the man after God's heart, 'There is none like that; give it me!' (1 Sam. xxi. 8.)

[r] Apol. I. § 85, 86, pp. 97, 98.

Digitized by Google

ON THE APOSTLE PETER'S RESIDENCE IN ROME.*

As the natural consequence of, and exactly in proportion to, the meagreness of the information given by the New Testament, especially as regards the period posterior to the events narrated in the twelfth chapter of Acts, concerning the life and actions of the Apostle Peter, in comparison at least with what we are there told of the labours of the Apostle Paul, was the success that attended Legend, with its accompanying train of evils, in gradually embellishing with fables the narrative of Peter's life. It will be only, therefore, by employing a calm, a careful, and a searching criticism, that we shall be able to elicit the exact measure of truth contained in the legendary stories regarding him.[b] Such a criticism to be successful must draw a careful and well-defined line of demarcation between the original statements of primitive tradition and the forms these subsequently assumed; for in proportion as they were not derived from the canonical books of the New Testament, nor based upon original and accurate historical authority, was the ease with which they could be perverted and employed in the cause of error. Our intention in the following

---

* This article is from the translation which is in preparation by the Rev. Thomas Gordon, of Professor Karl Wieseler's important works on the Chronology of the Gospels and of the Apostolic Age:—

1. *Chronologische Synopse der Vier Evangelien*, Hamb., 1843.
2. *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, Goett., 1848.

[b] The principal works that adopt the Roman Catholic view, and maintain the truth of the traditions regarding Peter, are:—Baronii *Annales ad ann.* 44–46, 56, 69; Bellarmin *De Roman. Pontif.* Libr. ii.; and particularly Cortesii *De Romano itinere gestisque Principis Apostolorum*, Libri ii., first published in 1573: a new and improved edition was published in 1770, by Vincent Al. Constantius. On the other hand, many have altogether denied that Peter was ever in Rome, of whom may be named Spanheim, *De ficta profectione Petri Apostol. in urbem Romam*, 1679; Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das N. Test.*, i. 554; De Wette, *Einleitung*, ii. 314; Baur, *Der Apostel Paulus*, p. 212. Those, however, seem to me to come to a more correct conclusion who maintain that Peter was in Rome but for a short time immediately before his death, and that he suffered martyrdom there. Of Roman Catholic writers who hold this view I may mention the anonymous author of the treatise *Ueber den Aufenthalt des Apostels Petrus in Rom,—zugleich als Beitrag zur aeltesten christlichen Chronologie* in the *Tuebinger theol. Quartalschrift, von Drey, Herbst, und Hirscher*, 1820, iv. 567.—(On Peter's Residence in Rome, a contribution to primitive Christian Chronology.) Hug, *Einleitung*, ii. 69, *seq.*, 550, *seq.*: of Protestant authors, Credner, *Einleitung*, i. 628; Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 101 (English, vol. i. p. 78); Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, ii. 514 (English, vol. ii. p. 35); Guerike, *Einleitung*, p. 439. See also Salom. van Til, *De Petro Romæ Martyre, non Pontifice*, 1710.

Excursus

Digitized by Google

Excursus is to treat *only* of Peter's Residence in Rome, which, as is well known, is most closely connected with the Primacy claimed by the Bishop of Rome over the Catholic Church. In investigating this point, however, it will be absolutely necessary that we examine in some detail the First Epistle of Peter. We reckon this essential, partly because many authors, particularly those of an earlier date, have connected it with Peter's labours in Rome, being of opinion that by the Babylon mentioned in 1 Pet. v. 13, Rome is meant; and partly because this epistle must, as forming a constituent portion of the New Testament Canon, and as being Peter's own composition, be looked upon as the best testimony regarding a particular period of his life, and may thus—indirectly at least—be of considerable value in enabling us to come to a conclusion on the question under discussion.

In so far as relates to the genuineness of the First Epistle of Peter, I do not think that I need here offer any further proofs; for in so far as concerns the external testimony in its behalf, it is, as is well known, one of those epistles whose origin was in the Primitive Church almost universally admitted,[a] while there are no internal arguments against its genuineness, except the great similarity between the doctrines there taught by Peter and those of Paul. This, however, when we take into consideration the state-

[a] Its opponents are in the habit of appealing principally to the Canon of Muratori as the most ancient testimony in support of their views. But, apart from the evident corruption of the text in the passage referring to Peter's Epistles, the correctness of this view can be maintained only on the assumption that Muratori, who was the original editor, gives the correct arrangement and punctuation. This, however, rests altogether on his own conjecture, as the original manuscript is punctuated in but very few passages. I have endeavoured, in an article on the Canon of Muratori, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1847, *Heft* 4, p. 840, to show that the words *apocalypse* (*apocalypsis*) *etiam Johannis*, should be construed with those immediately preceding; and, further, that the probable reading of the remainder of the passage is *Et Petri tantum recipimus, quam* (*quem*) *quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia noluut*, and that it should be interpreted as follows:—'Of Peter, in like manner, we have received as much—that is as much as of John, of whom he had just been speaking, viz., two epistles and an apocalypse—which some of our brethren are unwilling should be read in the church.' Other probable interpretations are given in the article referred to. I think, however, that I have satisfactorily shown that the word *apocalypsis* cannot, as has commonly been done, be referred to *Petri*. Since, then, it was only in consequence of this supposition that the apocryphal apocalypse of Peter was received by the Romish Church, to the exclusion of his first Epistle, this opinion, which seems to me untenable, altogether apart from the words of Muratori, must fall to the ground.

[The important fragment to which Dr. Wieseler refers was first published by Muratori in his *Antiqq. Ital. Med. Ævv.*, iii. 851, *sqq.* He attributes it to the Roman presbyter Caius, who flourished about 196 A.D. It was merely republished by Routh in his *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, iv. 1. Wieseler, who in 1845 caused a new collation of the original manuscript to be made, has, in the article above referred to, given first the text and then a full exposition of its contents. The article forms a contribution so valuable to sacred hermeneutics, that we may probably give a translation of it in a subsequent number.]

ments

Digitized by Google

ments contained in the Acts and even in Galatians ii. 11, *seq.*, cannot appear strange. For my own part, at least, I cannot look upon that method of criticism as based upon accurate principles, which would endeavour to deduce Peter's real doctrinal views from the apocryphal Clementines and such like subordinate productions of an after-age, rather than from the New Testament. But further, when we take into account the object of the Epistle, we cannot be surprised at the similarity which we find between the views there advocated by Peter and those taught by Paul in his Epistles; for Peter (v. 12) expressly declares that his object was to testify that that was the true grace of God wherein they stood. It is, therefore, plainly and explicitly stated that they that had preached the Gospel unto them were filled with the Holy Ghost (i. 12), and that the word preached unto them was the Word of the Lord (i. 25). And if we observe (i. 1) what were the countries of those to whom the Epistle was addressed, we find that the Gospel had been preached there chiefly, if not exclusively, by Paul and his immediate disciples (comp. 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16). Peter, therefore, in the same spirit that actuated Paul (1 Cor. iii. 11; xv. 11; Gal. i. 8, 9; ii. 2, 6-9; Ephes. ii. 20; iii. 3 *al.*), while he addressed to them these admonitions and instructions that were calculated to promote purity of life and doctrine among the churches there, was careful to give a prominent place to those doctrines which would show that he gave his full assent to those that Paul had preached to them.

I must, now that I am about to enter into a searching inquiry in regard to the *time* that the First Epistle of Peter was written, begin by determining the exegetical meaning of several passages. In accordance with the prevailing opinion, I assume that the Silvanus mentioned in 1 Pet. v. 12 is identical with Silas (Acts xv. 22, 27, 32-34, 40; xvi. 19—xvii. 10, 15; xviii. 5) or Silvanus (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 19). From these passages we learn that he originally belonged to the church in Jerusalem, and that he was from the first acquainted with Peter. He then accompanied Paul on his missionary journey from Antioch through Asia Minor to Greece; but when the Apostle returned to Antioch he appears to have remained either there or in Jerusalem (Acts xviii. 18-22). At any rate, we no longer find him in the company of Paul; while he must undoubtedly have separated from him before the Epistles to the Corinthians were written, for, had this not been the case, his name would certainly have occurred in the inscriptions to these Epistles (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; comp. 2 Cor. i. 19). We cannot then be surprised if at a subsequent period, when the First Epistle of Peter was written, we find him acting as Peter's assistant. Further, I do not expect to be

Digitized by Google

be contradicted when I refer the ἔγραψα, 'I have written,' of 1 Pet. v. 12, not to an earlier epistle, but to the one under consideration.[d] A question, it is true, may be raised, how the passage, 'By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you (as I suppose), I have written briefly,'[e] should be explained. The preposition διά, indeed, may denote that Silas was the amanuensis to whom Peter dictated this Epistle (Rom. xvi. 22); if so, however, these words would be altogether unnecessary, for in this case we should rather have to consider Silas as the author of the Epistle which he had written at the request of Peter, and out of materials communicated to him by the Apostle. This view, which is sometimes taken, as for example by Böhme and Reuss, is adopted principally for the purpose of affording a probable explanation of the similarity between the teaching of Peter and that of Paul. Little, however, can be said in its support: for if Peter had been desirous of supporting by *his own* authority the doctrines that had been preached to his readers, it would have been but fitting, that, if at all possible, he should have written himself; while further, every reader of the Epistle who has read it as far as ch. v. 11, must be of opinion, that all the preceding portion has been written by the Apostle himself; indeed, it is difficult to imagine that any other writer would have spoken of Peter in such guarded terms as is done in ch. v. 1. Again, it might naturally have been expected, that if Silas had not been going in person to those to whom the Epistle is addressed, he would at least have sent them his salutation[f] (v. 13). It is only on the supposition that Peter was not himself sufficiently acquainted with Greek that we can imagine that he deputed Silas to write the Epistle; and even in this case, we must conclude, from what has been already said, that he merely translated into Greek what Peter had originally written in Aramaic. But of this there are no traces in the style of the Epistle. Had this been the case, moreover, we might naturally have expected that the peculiar relation in which Silas stood to the Epistle would have been noticed in ch. v. 12, and that his

---

[d] See Steiger *in loco*.

[e] διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν, τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ὡς λογίζομαι, δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα.

[f] See Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, ii. 312 (English v. ii. p. 32). I understand ὡς λογίζομαι, 'as I suppose,' as referring to δι' ὀλίγων, 'briefly.' The epistle in itself, or considered merely as a letter, was detailed enough, yet too short to give full vent to the feelings of the writer. His love would have prompted him to write at still greater length (see Hebrews xiii. 22). The view adopted anew, and urged by Steiger, seems to me altogether untenable; he makes the ὑμῖν dependent on πιστοῦ, thus understanding the Apostle as if he had said τοῦ ὑμῖν πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, 'the brother faithful unto you,' and referring ὡς λογίζομαι to this passage. Undoubtedly the best recommendation that could be given to Silas was to call him simply ὁ πιστὸς ἀδελφός, 'the faithful brother.'

salutation

Digitized by Google

salutation would not have been there left out. The Presbyter John[g] calls Mark a ἑρμενεύτης Πέτρου, 'an interpreter or secretary of Peter,' but he evidently does so, not as implying that the Apostle had preached, or *could* preach the Gospel only in the Aramaic language. We must, therefore, fall back upon the commonly received opinion, which is, that Silas was the bearer of the Epistle to the churches named in ch. i. 1. It is evident that the selection of Silas for this office was particularly suitable, as he had formerly been Paul's companion, and had himself aided the Apostle in founding many of those very churches to which he was now to be sent. In the circumstance then, of his being made the bearer of the Epistle, there was an express recognition of the truth of that Gospel which he had then preached to these churches.

The next question that presents itself is in regard to the meaning of the words, 'the *Church that is* at Babylon elected together with you, saluteth you.'[h] In the first place, it is evident that Babylon cannot be here understood as symbolically put for Rome, as many of the older writers following Eusebius and Jerome[i] have maintained; for, in order to arrive at this conclusion, they have unwarrantably, and without attending to the context, introduced the Apocalyptical and symbolical language employed in the Revelation (xvi. 19; xvii. 5, 9, 18; xviii. 2) into the plain prose of an epistolary style; while in the second place, it is also clear that by the place here named simply Babylon, we must understand not Babylon in Egypt, but the celebrated city on the Euphrates, which then belonged to the Parthian empire.[k] But what

---

[g] *Apud* Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 39.

[h] Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή.

[i] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 15; Jerome, *Script. Eccles. sub Petro: Petrus post episcopatum Antiochensis ecclesiæ et prædicationem dispersionis eorum qui de circumcisione crediderunt in Ponto, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, et Bithynia, secundo Claudii anno ad repugnandum Simonem Magum Romam pergit, ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis*—'Peter, after having been Bishop of the Church of Antioch, and after having preached to those of the circumcision in dispersion throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia who believed, goes to Rome in the second year of Claudius for the purpose of discomfiting Simon Magus, and there occupied the sacerdotal chair for twenty-five years, till the last year of Nero.'

[k] This opinion is confirmed by the following arguments:—It is evident from what is said in the Talmud, from Josephus, and from Philo, that there was in Babylon a great number of Jews. Josephus (*Antiq.*, xv. 3. 1) says, οὐ γὰρ ὀλίγαι μυριάδες τοῦδε τοῦ λαοῦ περὶ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν ἀπῳκίσθησαν, 'for there were not a few myriads of this people that dwelt about Babylonia;' compare *Antiq.*, xv. 2. 2; xvii. 2. 1–3; xviii. 9. 1. 7–9. If we may believe these passages, the multitude of the Jews was so great as even to alarm the neighbouring princes, while, after many other misfortunes, in Seleucia alone fifty thousand of them were slain. Philo, in his *De Legatione ad Caj.*, p. 587, after mentioning the general dispersion of the Jews, writes as follows:—καὶ σωστῶν τας πέρας τῶν Εὐφράτου (ἠπείρους)· πᾶσαι γὰρ ἔμ μέρους βραχέος Βαβυλῶνος

Digitized by Google

what are we to understand by the ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή? Some, arguing from the words 'my son,' which come immediately after, understand them as referring to Peter's wife (Matt. viii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5); but the common opinion, supported by the Peschito and Vulgate versions, and held by Steiger, De Wette, and others, is, that it refers to the *church* in Babylon. This latter view is, in my opinion, undoubtedly the correct one. I do not comprehend how the word συνεκλεκτή, 'elected together,' can convey the idea of a wife, especially as since ὑμᾶς, 'you,' is the antecedent, ὑμῖν is the only word that can, in accordance with the principles of syntax, be supplied to συνεκλεκτή, 'elected together;' nor can I on this supposition see what could have induced Peter to add the words 'in Babylon.' If, on the other hand, we understand the church to be meant, all becomes at once plain. It is called συνεκλεκτή, because Christians in general, and consequently those whom the Apostle addresses in the first verse of the Epistle, are 'elect;' while the words 'in Babylon' mark the locality of the church that sends the salutation. The feminine form, which has proved a stumbling-block to many, is easily explained, when

---

Βαβυλῶνος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σατραπειῶν, ἀλ' ἀμετρεῖται ἴχνεσι τὴν ἐν πάλαι γῆν, Ἰουδαίους ἔχουσι οἰκήτορας; 'And I do not speak of (the colonies) beyond the Euphrates, for excepting a small part of Babylon and some other satrapies, scarce any country of note can be mentioned in which there are not Jewish inhabitants.' We further learn from the Talmud and from Josephus (*Antiq.*, xvii. 2. 2; xviii. 9. 1) that the Jews of Babylon maintained a close and constant intercourse with those of Palestine, and that by their gifts, offerings and sacrifices, they continually manifested their regard for the temple at Jerusalem. It is evident, then, that if an endeavour was to be made to preach the Gospel to the Jewish proselytes out of Palestine, there was no country more likely to commend itself to the notice of the Apostles residing in Palestine than Mesopotamia and Babylon. Indeed there is actually an old tradition that Thomas preached in Parthia. If, then, Peter had as early as the year 54 A.D.—that is, at the time of Paul's journey to Jerusalem, mentioned in Galat. ii. 7, 8 (see Wieseler's *Chronol. d. Apost. Zeitalt.*, p. 208)—been recognized as the Apostle of the circumcision, as Paul then was of the uncircumcision, and if he had even then reserved to himself the Jews as the special field of his future labours, it is surely very natural to suppose that he would preach in a city so celebrated as Babylon, particularly as there are many other traces of his having preached beyond the limits of Palestine, and as it is not till a later period that we can demonstrate satisfactorily that he laboured also in the provinces of the West, which had at first been specially allotted to Barnabas and Paul. Nor can it be urged as a valid objection against this conclusion that Josephus (*Antiq.*, xviii. 9. 8) tells us, that after the massacre of Anilæus the Jewish leader and his adherents, under the Emperor Caius, many Jews fled away in terror from Babylon to Seleucia, and that six years afterwards others followed in consequence of a pestilence; for those who fled away might have afterwards returned, while, at any rate, many Jews must have remained behind in the town as well as in the province of Babylon. But still further, we have no grounds for supposing that the Christian Church at Babylon consisted only of Jews. On this account, therefore, I do not see why we should understand the word as referring to the satrapy of this name, and not to the city. Finally, the arrangement adopted in naming the churches enumerated in i. 1, is in accordance with the view that Babylon on the Euphrates is meant.

we

Digitized by Google

we consider that the Apostle, when he employed the plural ὑμας, 'you,' was thinking of the *churches* (εκκλησίαι) addressed—for the Epistle is addressed to several. If this interpretation be correct, we can hardly understand the words 'Mark my son,' as referring to one actually the son of Peter, but, in accordance with a common method of expression, of which we have examples in 1 Cor. iv. 16-18; Gal. iv. 19; 1 Tim. i. 2, 18; 2 Tim. i. 2; ii. 1, to his spiritual son, the Evangelist Mark, the well known assistant both of Peter and Paul. This view was held by Origen,[m] by Eusebius himself,[n] and by many others. In truth, those that entertain the opinion that an actual son is here spoken of, can hold it only on the supposition that the words 'elected together' refer to Peter's wife. In this case, indeed, we should be almost shut up to the supposition that the married Peter had a grown up son named Mark, who sends the salutation contained in verse 13. If, on the other hand, as has been demonstrated, συνεκλεκτή must be understood as referring to the Christian Church in Babylon, it is still more plain that we must here understand υἱος, 'son,' in a spiritual sense. If then, Mark, without any further designation than merely his name, be named along with the whole church, and if a salutation be sent by him only, we may naturally conclude that he was some distinguished assistant of the Apostle, who was well known to those to whom the Epistle was addressed, and who stood in a peculiar relation to them. But we know only *one* Mark in whom these two characteristics are found united; whilst it would be very strange if a son of Peter, whose name was Mark, should, despite of his being mentioned here, be altogether unnoticed in traditions of the church, which was so fond of dilating on the events of Peter's life. We conclude, then, that the Mark here mentioned was that well known Evangelist who stood to those to whom the Epistle was addressed in a similar relation to that occupied by Silas, who had just been named. Nor is it at all surprising that the Evangelist Mark should be called the spiritual *son of Peter*, for we know (Acts xii. 12, *sqq.*) that the Apostle was well acquainted with his mother Mary, who had a house in Jerusalem; while Mark himself, who, if we may believe the ancient testimony of the Presbyter John,[o] was not an immediate

[m] *Ap.* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vi. 25. [n] *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 15.

[o] *Ap.* Eusebius, *Hist Eccl.* iii. 39. Και τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγεν· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα· οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσε τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ ὡς ἔφην Πέτρῳ, κ.τ.λ.—'The Presbyter spoke thus: Mark having become secretary to Peter, wrote with accuracy whatever things he remembered; but he did not observe the chronological order of the things said and done by Christ, for he neither heard nor followed the Lord, but at a later period, as I have said, followed Peter.'

Digitized by Google

immediate disciple of our Lord, seems to have been converted to Christianity by Peter.

The readers of the Epistle are, in ch. i. 1, called 'the elect strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.'[p] The use of the word διασπορά has led commentators, from the earliest times, to look upon it as addressed to *Jewish* Christians; because in James i. 1, they found the twelve tribes spoken of as being ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, 'in the dispersion (scattered abroad).' This view was held by Origen,[q] who, however, as it appears, expresses himself doubtfully in the matter, unless we choose to refer the word ἔοικεν 'seems' to the personal preaching of Peter and Paul, as well as by Eusebius,[r] by Jerome,[s] by Epiphanius,[t] and by many later expositors. But the proper meaning of the word διασπορά does not compel us to adopt this conclusion: for James, since he does not mean Christians in general—the spiritual Israel—considers it necessary to state expressly their Jewish descent; while John, vii. 35, speaks of the διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων 'the dispersed of the Gentiles.' This expression originally denoted removal from the Holy Land, from Judea, and from Jerusalem, from the centre of religious worship. (Compare Ps. cxlvii. 2 (cxlvi. 2, in the Septuagint) and James i. 1.) In John vii. 35, the context (v. 34, 36) shows that the διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων must be sought beyond the bounds of Judea; while the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπίσμενα, 'the children of God that were scattered abroad' (John xi. 52), must also, from its being opposed to the ἔθνος 'nation,' be understood as referring to those out of Palestine who had received the Gospel. The *abstract* διασπορὰ 'dispersion,' may naturally stand for the *concrete*, the whole body of the dispersed, while in this case, the meaning of the latter may in its turn be more accurately defined and limited by an accompanying genitive (John vii. 35, Ps. cxlvii. 2). It is evident, however, that the great majority of those to whom Peter addressed his Epistle must be looked upon as *Gentile* Christians; partly from the internal evidence afforded by the Epistle (i. 14, 18; ii. 9, 10; iii. 6; iv. 3, &c.), and partly from what the Book of Acts and the Epistles of Paul tell us concerning the churches of Galatia and Asia Minor. Credner,[u] Neudekker,[x] and others

---

Peter.' &c. These words of the Presbyter, Eusebius has borrowed from a work of Papias. I content myself with merely quoting the words of the Presbyter John, since, as the Presbyter was himself a disciple of our Lord, they contain the oldest conceivable testimony in regard to this matter. See my article on the Presbyter John in Pelt's *Theolog. Mitarbeiten*, 1840, *Heft* 4.

[p] Ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας.

[q] *Ap.* Euseb. iii. 1. [r] *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 4. [s] *Ut supra*, p. 5, note i.

[t] *Hær.*, 27. [u] *Einleit.*, i. 638. [x] *Einleit.*, 697.

Digitized by Google

have,

have, on the other hand, imagined that there is in the inscription of the Epistle itself an express reference to the heathen descent of those to whom it is addressed—the word παρεπίδημοι, 'strangers,' in their opinion meaning proselytes. But these are in other passages called 'proselytes,' 'worshippers,' 'devout,' 'pious,'[y] all referring to those Gentiles who had embraced Judaism: so that I do not think Credner[z] has succeeded in demonstrating the correctness of the *usus loquendi* adopted by him. He is, however, right in maintaining, in opposition to Pott, De Wette, and others, that the term παρεπίδημοι, 'strangers,' cannot mean Christians of Jewish descent, who were strangers in Pontus, &c., in so far at least as it is thereby implied that Judea was really their home; for this antithesis to Judea is already implied in the word διασπορά, 'dispersion,' and thus, independent altogether of the strange sense of the passage, the two expressions would be purely tautological. I have no doubt that Didymus, Bengel, Steiger, and others are right in understanding by παρεπίδημοι, 'pilgrims, strangers on the earth.' Παρεπίδημος, it is well known, means one who tarries in a place for a little while, but with the intention of soon resuming his journey. The home to which the believer, who knoweth that he hath everlasting fellowship with the Father, journeys during the few and short years of his pilgrimage on earth, is heaven, where he shall see his Saviour[a] (Heb. xi. 13, 14, 16). That

[y] Προσήλυτοι, φοβούμενοι, σεβόμενοι, εὐλαβεῖς.

[z] He holds, too, that πάροικοι means proselytes: but the passages which he adduces from the Septuagint in support of the opinion, viz., Lev. xxv. 23, 47, Gen. xxiii. 4, Ps. xxxviii. 13, evidently do not prove that the word bears the *religious* meaning for which he argues; as little can he deduce this from Ephes. ii. 19, where the Apostle is thinking of the theocracy. Nor has the word ἐπιδημοῦντες, which we find joined to Ῥωμαῖοι in Acts ii. 10, any religious meaning; it merely designates those who, born in Rome, had come to reside in Jerusalem (comp. Acts. xvii. 21). The word ἐπιδημοῦντες is used to define them more particularly, because there were Jews who, though born in Jerusalem, were Romans, that is Roman citizens. The words Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι, 'both Jews and proselytes,' refer not to the Ῥωμαῖοι alone, but to all the nations previously named.

[a] The passages which Steiger, in his *Commentary*, p. 16, adduces from the Old Testament in support of this view, are not exactly identical. I quote them according to the Septuagint, where we find the expressions πάροικος, 'a sojourner,' παροικεῖν, 'to sojourn,' and παρεπίδημος, 'stranger.' In Gen. xlvii. 9, where Jacob speaks of the years of his own life and of that of his father as being a pilgrimage, the context will hardly allow us to understand him as speaking of his pilgrimage towards heaven, but rather as referring to his weary and unsuccessful wandering in that promised land which they were afterwards to inherit. But in the case of the Christian—in regard to whom those promises made to the patriarch, but for a time unfulfilled, were accomplished in the arrangement of the Divine economy of redemption—the pilgrimage of life through this world would be considered as terminating only in the expectation of unfailing glory in heaven. This is the case with the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 13), who evidently had in view these and similar passages of the Pentateuch. The passages in Ps. xxxix. 13 and 1 Chron. xxix. 15, in which the Septuagint uses the words πάροικος and παρεπίδημος, appear to me still more analogous, because in them the original seeks to exhibit

Digitized by Google

That this is Peter's meaning is evident from the following reasons: the idea again and again recurs—indeed it pervades the whole Epistle—that Christians have their home and inheritance in heaven (i. 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, *et al.*); that their manifold tribulations on earth will last but for a short season (i. 6, v. 10); and that they who pass the time of their sojourning on earth as pilgrims must abstain from fleshly lusts (i. 17, ii. 11). It is very natural, then, that this fundamental idea which pervades the whole Epistle should occur in the inscription as characterizing those to whom it is addressed. This exegesis is the more to be preferred, as we find—not the idea merely—but the very image employed in ch. i. 17, and ii. 11; while in this latter passage we have the very word παρεπίδημος occurring in the sense contended for by us; and surely a writer is his own best expositor. The objection of De Wette that this interpretation of παρεπίδημος is impossible, on account of the geographical definition contained in the words διασπορᾶς Πόντου κ. τ. λ. 'scattered throughout Pontus, etc., is untenable; for the local definition Πόντου κ. τ. λ 'Pontus,' etc., belongs only to διασπορᾶς, 'scattered throughout,' which must be considered not as the abstract but as the concrete. I would therefore translate ch. i. 1 thus: Peter—to the pilgrims of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, elect, according to the foreknowledge[b] of God the Father, etc.—'according to the foreknowledge' and the following words being understood as defining more precisely 'the elect.' The pilgrims of the dispersion in Pontus are those Christians who constitute the dispersion in those countries. They are thus distinguished from other Christians, who are all pilgrims on the earth—from the Christians of Judea, as well as from those in the dispersion in other places. Nor is there here anything that should lead us to the conclusion that the Christians addressed were of Jewish descent, for 'dispersion (διασπορά)' is not at all equivalent to ὁ λαὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, 'the people of Israel.' Both the Jewish and Gentile Christians of these churches are, doubtless, addressed; while from the contents of the Epistle, and from what we know of the state of these churches, we may infer that the great majority of their members were Gentile Christians.[c] This, however, is clear,

exhibit the transitoriness of life under the image of homelessness. The idea that man is a stranger on the earth, and that his home is with God in heaven, is, perhaps, expressed in Ps. cxix. 18. See also the words of Æschines as quoted by Steiger, *Dial. Socrat.*, iii. 3; παροικιδημία τίς ἐστιν ὁ βίος—'Life is a kind of sojourn.'

[b] In opposition to De Wette and others, I make a distinction between πρόγνωσις, 'foreknowledge,' and προορισμός, 'predestination,' as in Rom. viii. 29, προέγνω, 'he foreknew,' is distinguished from προώρισε, 'he predestined.'

[c] For additional arguments in support of this opinion see Lardner, iii. 417-419, 4to.—*Tr.*

that

Digitized by Google

that even Peter, when like James (ch. i. 1) he applies the word διασπορά to those Christian churches, must, even at that late period, have looked upon Judea and Jerusalem—the city of the Saviour's death and the place whence Christianity was diffused—as the real (local) centre of Christianity, around which were to be grouped the churches in other lands that had in course of time been formed. Indeed, we have the testimony of the New Testament and of history that it remained so till the members of the Church there, in obedience to our Lord's command, as recorded in Matth. xxiv. 15-21; Mark xiii. 14-23; Luke xxi. 20-24, left Jerusalem shortly before its siege and destruction, and withdrew to Pella in Peræa.[d]

It has been a very generally entertained opinion that Peter himself preached the Gospel to the churches in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. But this opinion has no other foundation than the circumstance that his first Epistle was addressed to these churches. Origen[e] mentions it, though perhaps only as a conjecture; while Eusebius himself,[f] who is followed by Jerome[g] (*ut supra*, p. 5), expressly founds his statement upon the Epistle itself. But that Peter, at least when he wrote the Epistle, had never been in those countries, is clear from the circumstance that he nowhere alludes to any personal acquaintance with those whom he addresses; but, on the contrary, always speaks of those who had first preached the Gospel to them in the third person (i. 12, 25); while we are told that the principal end he had in view in writing was to demonstrate that the doctrine of salvation that had been preached unto them was true (v. 12).

We have thus obtained the following grounds to assist us in determining when this Epistle was written. The Gospel had already been preached in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, and this, it would seem, principally by Paul and his disciples and assistants; but Peter had not preached there. He was tarrying with the Christian church in Babylon, on the Euphrates, and with him were Silas and Mark, Paul's former assistants. The former of these he commissioned to convey this Epistle to the strangers of the dispersion.

---

[d] See Wieseler's article in the *Vierteljahrschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1846, Heft 2, p. 213, called *Der Gräuel der Verwüstung an heiliger Stätte*, u. s. w. (The Abomination of Desolation in the Holy Place, &c.).

[e] *Ap.* Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 1.

[f] *Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 4.

[g] Jerome, it will be seen in the passage referred to, dates the Apostle's preaching and the writing of this epistle very early, even before the second year of Claudius, in which Peter is reported to have come to Rome; for the connection between this statement and the argument that by Babylon, spoken of in ver. 13, we must understand Rome (see above, p. 5). Writers of the present day are more correct in assigning a much later date to the First Epistle of Peter.

Hug,

Digitized by Google

Hug, Neander, De Wette, and other authors maintain, though in my opinion without sufficient grounds, that the sufferings which Peter seems to fear are about to try the Christians (ch. i. 6, iii. 17), and which, in another place, he speaks of as already accomplished (v. 9), must necessarily be referred to the period after the noted persecution by Nero, in 64 A.D. (ch. iii. 13-17, iv. 12-19, v. 6-9; also ch. ii. 19-21). On the other hand, Credner, Steiger, and others have justly remarked, that temporary persecutions of the Christians were, from the time of the crucifixion of Jesus, continually recurring in particular places; (see Acts *passim*, 1 Cor. iv. 9-13; xv. 31, 32; 2 Cor. xi. 23-27; 1 Thess. i. 6, 7, 14-16; 2 Thess. i. 5; Philip. i. 28-30; Heb. x. 32-34, etc. etc.), while the idea of sufferings is in Peter's writings of such continual recurrence, that we must beware of imagining that it always refers to judicial trials, much less to persecutions unto blood. But are the sufferings, as is argued, really so depicted that they can only be referred to the period after that persecution under Nero? What were the earlier trials of Christian sufferers but the endurance of reproach for the name of Christ (iv. 14)? In these cases there is not a word said of any actual persecution. The same characteristic do we find in the Gospels (Matt. v. 11, 12; Luke vi. 22, 23; Matt. xiv. 9; Mark xiii. 12, 13; Luke xxi., 17, &c.; also 2 Cor. i. 5; iv. 7—11); while this too is the meaning of the passage in 1 Peter iv. 16, 'to suffer as a Christian' (compare Acts xi. 26), as is evident from the context and from the antithesis in ch. iv. 15. The word 'answer' or 'apology,' in ch. iii. 15, can hardly refer to a defence before a court of law, though even in this case it would prove nothing. Hug and Neander attach peculiar importance to the circumstance, that in ch. iii. 16, Christians are called 'evil-doers;' and it must be confessed that this would be a powerful argument in support of their view, did the word really mean here traitors or seditious persons—the *malefici*, 'evil-doers,' of the Romans; for though, except by Orosius,[h] we are not told that the Emperor Nero after the persecution in Rome issued a formal edict in which Christians, *as such*, were throughout the whole empire proclaimed to be *malefici*, and their meetings declared to be *collegia illicita*, 'unlawful assemblies;' yet such a fact, though being unsupported by older authority not very probable, is yet far enough from being altogether impossible. But this meaning can hardly be attached to κακοποιός in this verse: for, according to it, the Christians were 'falsely' so accused, which would not have been the case if at that time the mere circumstance of a man being, or being called, a Christian,

[h] *Hist.*, vii. 7.

made

Digitized by Google

made him a criminal in the eye of the law. That 'evil-doers' has here a more extended meaning is evident from the antithesis expressed in the words 'good conversation in Christ,' while, in the explanatory verse (17), we have 'evil-doing,' as the antithesis of the 'well-doing,' which has no restricted meaning (compare ch. iii. 12, iv. 15, ii. 19, 20). The meaning of all these passages is simply that the Christian should not, by his evil conversation, make himself deserving of his trials; but, when he suffers wrongfully and merely for the name of Christ, whom he confesses, he will obtain abundant consolation; he will fulfill his calling, and he will gainsay and put to shame all his adversaries. At most, we may, from what the Apostle says regarding the sufferings endured by the Christians to which he so often recurs, deduce the *general* chronological result, that when this Epistle was written, they occupied, throughout the whole Roman empire, a more constrained position than they had before done, and that they saw before them a still more troubled future. This would bring us into the latter years of Nero's reign, when, after his first *quinquennium*, he began to reign more despotically, and the administrative power of the empire began to be exercised in a more unjust and tyrannical manner, but not necessarily to the period subsequent to his celebrated persecution.

But there are additional reasons to be adduced in support of this view. I look upon the date of Peter's martyrdom at Rome, during the Neronian persecution, which broke out soon after the 19th of July, 64 A.D., as the extreme *terminus ad quem* in regard to the writing of his Epistle,[1] while I consider the extreme *terminus a quo* to be the time of Paul's separation from Silas, whom we find in our Epistle with Peter in Babylon. The earliest assignable date for this separation, and for the events narrated in Acts xviii. 18, is 54 A.D.[k] The circumstance that the Gospel had been already preached in the countries enumerated in 1 Peter i. 1 (and this it appears by Paul and his disciples), brings us at least to the time when Paul had ended his labours in Ephesus and Asia (Acts xix.), or to 57 A.D. Further, the Epistle could hardly have been couched in its present terms if the Apostle had himself been labouring there at the time; indeed, from 1 Peter i. 12, 25 (where the aorist is employed) we may conclude that the founders of the churches had completed their work and had already left those districts. When, then, we see

[1] In a previous excursus on Paul's residence in Rome, Dr. Wieseler arrives at the conclusion that Paul was but once imprisoned in Rome, and that he was martyred there some time between autumn 63 A.D. and spring 64 A.D., probably early in 64 A.D., while Peter perished in the Neronian persecution which broke out immediately after the burning of Rome on 19th July, 64 A.D.—*Tr.*

[k] See p. 305.

that

Digitized by Google

that churches were then flourishing in Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, and when, in addition to this, we take into consideration the evidence which this Epistle gives of the oppression which Christians at the time it was written endured throughout the Roman empire, we must, I think, come to the conclusion that it was not written before 60 A.D.—that is, not till after the beneficent *quinquennium* of Nero had come to an end; and consequently, during the imprisonment of the Apostle Paul. The period in which he who had had the principal share in the work of founding these churches, was prevented for an indefinite length of time from labouring among them, was naturally the most appropriate that a strange Apostle could select for arranging and settling their affairs. *We thus arrive at the conclusion that this Epistle was written some time in the years* 60—63. I may throw out the following conjecture as not improbable:—We know that the Mark mentioned in 1 Peter v. 13, whom we look upon as the same as the Evangelist, was with Paul in Rome when the Epistle to the Colossians was written and dispatched, that is in 61 or 62 A.D., but that he intended soon to leave him; and we know further, that in the latter part of the summer of 63 A.D., when the Second Epistle to Timothy was written, he had not returned to Paul, for Timothy is requested to take him and bring him back with him to Rome (2 Tim. iv. 11). If, then, I may venture to suppose that Mark at that time went directly to Asia, and that his salutation in 1 Peter v. 13 indicates his intimate acquaintance with the churches addressed, it seems to me not improbable that Peter wrote his Epistle after Mark had paid a visit to these countries. For not merely is it nowhere else said that Mark had ever before been in these countries, but the contrary is evident from Coloss. iv. 10, where the Colossians are exhorted simply 'to receive' Mark (δέξασθε αὐτόν), and where nothing is said about their doing so with all gladness, as in the case of Epaphroditus (Philip. ii. 29). This, then, seems to me to indicate an apprehension on the part of Paul that, did he not give this apostolic commission, the Colossians might have refused, on account of Mark's voluntary separation from the other Apostles (Acts xv. 38), to recognize him as his assistant. Moreover, if the opinion that Peter, previous to writing his own Epistle, had seen those of Paul to the Ephesians and Colossians, be well founded,[m] this view allows the possibility of his having done so, in so far as regards the question of

[m] See the list of parallel passages in De Wette, *Einleitung*, s. 318 *ff.* If we suppose that Peter in writing his epistle had regard to those of Paul, we can perfectly understand its tendency, which is to render clear the sameness of his doctrines with those of Paul.

time,

Digitized by Google

time. I imagine that the matter stood thus:—When Mark arrived in Asia Minor he found in some of the churches there and in the neighbouring provinces, a tendency to fall away from the true Gospel preached by Paul, and to adopt Judaizing views. This tendency, which had, as we learn from the Epistle to the Galatians, shown itself in these churches on a previous occasion, was likely enough to recur. They might, for example, appeal to the Apostle Peter, and to occurrences like those narrated in Galat. ii. 11—16, which would naturally enough be taken advantage of by men who had party views to support.[n] It was probably with the intention of counteracting such tendencies that Paul, in the Epistle which he wrote to the Ephesians about the same time, gave a sketch of the true doctrine (Ephes. iii. 3, 4), and that in it he gave peculiar prominence to the perfect harmony that existed among the apostles in regard to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity (Ephes. iii. 5; ii. 20). We see from Coloss. ii. 14-17, that the false teachers there had also manifested a Judaizing tendency. Soon afterwards we find from Philipp. iii. 2—4, that Judaizing teachers were busy in Philippi, while even into the Alexandrian church the Jewish element seemed about to intrude itself.[o] If, then, Peter himself declared that his views and those of Paul entirely harmonized, such a declaration must have acted as an effectual antidote to the spread of such errors among those churches to which our Epistle was addressed. The special cause for such a declaration seems to have been the visit of Mark, who, whether of his own accord or in consequence of instructions from Paul, who could not on account of his imprisonment lend any personal help, must have given him detailed information regarding the state of these churches. If this view be well founded, *the Epistle must have been written at latest in the year* 63 A.D., *as towards the end of the summer of that year Mark was summoned back to Rome by Paul; its date, therefore, is between the years* 61 *and* 63, *and most probably in* 62 A.D. It is almost certain that at this date a Christian church must have long existed in Babylon on the Euphrates; nor is there any difficulty in supposing that Peter was then there, as we know that so early as 54 A.D. (Gal. ii. 8, 9) the apostleship of the circumcision had been committed to him.

Let us, now that we have completed the necessary investigation into the First Epistle of Peter, next proceed to the discussion of the question as to that Apostle's residence in Rome. That he did preach in Rome, and that he was crucified there, are points that can no longer be doubted when we bear in mind the results of our

[n] We see, for example, that there was a party in Corinth who named themselves after Peter, 1 Cor. i. 12.

[o] See Wieseler *Chron. Ap. Zeit.*, p. 489 *ff.*

[p] Excursus

Digitized by Google

'Excursus on Paul's Residence in Rome.'[p] We may here shortly recapitulate the grounds of this opinion. That Peter did actually suffer martyrdom can hardly be doubted, since it is distinctly asserted by contemporaries. If, however, Peter was martyred for his faith's sake, it must necessarily have been in Rome; for by every writer by whom the place of his death is mentioned, Rome is named. And when we remember the earnest and anxious struggles of the early Christian churches to enjoy the credit of having had among them as many and as celebrated martyrs as possible, we cannot for an instant imagine that the church of that place where he was really martyred would have refrained from claiming, as its peculiar property, an apostle so revered. It is impossible to account for such an unanimity in regard to the *place* of Peter's martyrdom, unless we look upon the whole story of his martyrdom as destitute of foundation. Further, Rome was at a comparatively very early date expressly named as the locality of his martyrdom. For though Clemens Romanus, having no particular reason for so doing, does not expressly name the *place* of his martyrdom, but merely mentions the *fact* in conjunction with that of Paul, who we know was put to death in Rome, we find his residence in Rome asserted in the *Prædicatio Petri*, a work dating from the beginning of the second century, and to which the *Prædicatio Pauli* formed an appendix; by Ignatius,[q] by Dionysius[r] of Corinth (about 170), by Irenæus,[s] by Tertullian,[t] and by the Roman presbyter Caius,[u] who speaks of the Vatican as the place of his martyrdom,—not to mention the Fathers of a later date, most of whom held the same opinion. All these witnesses of the second

---

[p] See Wieseler's Excursus on Paul's Residence in Rome, p. 547-551.

[q] *Epist. ad Rom.* c. 4; *ap. Cyprian. ed. Rigaltius*, p. 139; *Liber, qui inscribitur Pauli Prædicatio, in quo libro—invenies, post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum, post consolationem evangelii in Hierusalem et mutuam altercationem et rerum agendarum dispositionem postremo in urbe quasi tunc primum, invicem sibi ipse cognitos.* 'In the book which is entitled the preaching of Paul, you will find that after a long time Peter and Paul, having had a meeting at Jerusalem regarding the preaching of the Gospel, having had an altercation, and having come to an arrangement as to the method to be observed in their labours, *at last*, as if then for the first time, became acquainted *in the city*.' Compare Credner *Einleitung*, i. 629; Gieseler *Kirchengeschichte*, I. i., p. 102 (English, i. 77, where may be found in full the evidence of all the authors quoted in the text). Ignatius, *in loco*, writes: Οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν;—'I do not, like Peter and Paul, give you directions.'

[r] *Ap.* Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 25.

[s] *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 1, Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον κ.τ.λ. 'Matthew also wrote for the Hebrews a Gospel in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul preached and confirmed the church in Rome. After their departure (death),' etc. See also *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 3.

[t] *Apologet.*, 5.

[u] *Ap.* Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 25.

century,

Digitized by Google

century, with the exception of Ignatius, who speaks somewhat indefinitely on this point, unite in asserting that Paul and Peter *laboured in Rome at the same time*, and that they were both martyred in Rome about the same time. The conclusion at which we arrived in our 'Excursus on Paul's Residence in Rome' was, that this event took place in 64 A.D.; and we showed the probability that Paul suffered in consequence of an imperial decision in his case in the beginning of the year, while Peter was put to death shortly afterwards in the well known Neronian persecution, which took its origin in the burning of Rome on the 19th of July. We have, too, a very striking proof that these current traditions, to which we have just referred, are not founded on fable, but rest on a firm historical basis, in the circumstance that the accounts which Tacitus[x] gives of the persecution of the Christians set on foot by Nero. for the purpose of stifling the rumour that he had himself been accessory to the burning of the city, harmonize in a remarkable manner with the statement that Peter was martyred at the Vatican, as well as with what is recorded as to the manner of his death; while it is evident that this coincidence could *not* have originated in the ancient ecclesiastical writers moulding the story so as to make it harmonize with the narrative of Tacitus, for it is notorious that in regard to this matter the Christian writers of antiquity paid almost no attention to his statements. Indeed, it was in consequence of this, and of their being accustomed to speak of that persecution as altogether unconnected with the burning of Rome, that so much difficulty and confusion was caused in regard to its true date. After what has been said, we cannot hesitate in coming to the conclusion *that Peter was in Rome, and that he suffered martyrdom there in* 64 A.D. This, however, does not determine the question *when* he arrived in Rome, and whether, as the Romish church asserts, he there for a considerable time occupied the position of the first Bishop of Rome, and discharged the duties of that office. An after age, looking at the question with a reference to this point, has embellished with many legends the narrative of the Apostle's residence in Rome. We must not, however, on that account refuse to recognize the truth contained in the well supported testimony of the more ancient witnesses.

When Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth,[y] speaks of the church in Rome

---

[x] *Annal.* xv. 44.

[y] *Ap.* Euseb., ii. 25. Ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης νουθεσίας τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γενηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων συνεκεράσατε. Καὶ γὰρ ἄμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες ἡμᾶς ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμοῦ διδάξαντες ὁμωρεύησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν—'Thus likewise you, by means of such admonitions, have mingled the flourishing seed that had been planted by Peter and Paul among the Romans as well as the Corinthian Christians; for both of

Digitized by Google

Rome as being planted by Paul and Peter, as do also others of the authorities we have already quoted, we must evidently understand him as meaning only that they both laboured in Rome, not that Peter was as to date the original founder of the church there. For if Dionysius had intended the word φυτεύειν, 'to plant,' to be understood strictly in regard to time, it would not have been employed either when speaking of Paul's relation to the church in Rome or of that of Peter to the church in Corinth. But when another and different interest came into play, these expressions could be claimed by interested parties as being strictly chronological; and they were so claimed. Peter, by whose preaching and martyrdom Rome had been rendered famous, was said to have laboured there long before Paul's arrival; and in this case there was all the freer scope for the employment of fiction, because so many stories were afloat regarding the missionary journeys of an apostle so highly reverenced, and also because the Canon of the New Testament, by its almost total silence in regard to his life, presented no hindrances to the invention of such stories. The Apocryphal Clementines, too, especially in their more orthodox form of the *Recognitiones*,[2] contributed a good deal to the formation and diffusion of such legends, for here, as was at a later date the case in regard to the decretals of the pseudo-Isidore, was proved the truth of the proverb, *semper aliquid hæret*.

Of the Fathers, Eusebius in his Chronicon and in his Ecclesiastical History gives the most detailed and perfect form of the legend. He is in almost every particular followed by Jerome. As the former is usually appealed to, and as we are better able to follow him in his narrative, because he lays down his chronological system with greater detail, and because the grounds of his computations are still to a great extent extant, it will be necessary to devote some little space to the examination of his views. Unfortunately, we do not now possess the Greek text of the Chronicon of Eusebius, but only the Latin translation of Jerome, and the Armenian translation which is accessible in editions published both at Milan and at Venice, with which, however, should be compared Maii *Veterum Scriptorum Collectio Nova*, tom. viii. In regard to Peter's residence in Rome, we can accurately ascertain the views of Eusebius by comparing what he says in the Chronicon, with his statements in his Ecclesiastical History. The Armenian text places Peter's arrival in Rome *after* the founding of the Church in Antioch in the third year of

of these having planted our Church at Corinth likewise instructed us; and having in like manner taught together in Italy, they suffered martyrdom about the same time.'

[2] According to Schliemann (*Die Clementinische Recognitionen, eine Ueberarbeitung der Clementinen*, 1843), they were written some time between 212 and 230 A.D. See Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 1. s. 286 (English, i. 206-211).

Digitized by Google

Caius,

Caius, or 39 A. D.; Jerome places it in the second year of Claudius, or 42 A.D., in which year the Chronicon places the fulfilment of the famine foretold by Agabus (Acts xi. 28). Eusebius, too, must have entertained the same opinion as Jerome, for [c] he expressly states that Peter's imprisonment (Acts xii. 3-5) took place in the time of Claudius, while in *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 14, he places his first arrival in Rome also during the reign of Claudius. In unison with this is the statement in the Chronicon, that Evodius, the first Bishop of the Church of Antioch, which Eusebius asserts was also founded by Peter, did not assume this office till 42 A. D. After his arrival in Rome, Peter is said to have presided over the Roman Church for 20 years according to the Armenian text of the Chronicon, and for 25 years according to the Latin translation by Jerome. The latter must have been Eusebius' own view, for in the Chronicon he states that Peter was put to death 25 years afterwards, that is in 67 A.D., the thirteenth year of Nero. This date is rendered still more certain when we see that Eusebius places [d] the *first* year of Linus, who is said to have been first Bishop of Rome after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, in the year 68 A. D. For Linus is said [e] to have died in the second year of Titus, or 80 A. D., after having been Bishop for 12 years. Upon investigating the reasons that induced Eusebius to adopt this computation, we find that, in consequence of his having placed Paul's arrival in Rome *six* years too early—in the first year of Nero, or 55 A. D.—he was, by his chronological system, compelled to antedate considerably the commencement of Peter's labours there. For if Peter did really visit Rome before Paul, he must have been there *at least* during the reign of Claudius. Eusebius, however, expressly assigns the following story as a ground for his computation.[f] Simon Magus (Acts viii. 9-25) having come to Rome, had met with great success in propagating the false doctrines he taught. To counteract his labours, Peter was reported to have come to Rome, and to have discomfited him by his preaching and his power of working miracles. In support of this statement, Eusebius refers to Justin Martyr.[g] But it cannot be doubted, indeed modern authors have almost

[c] *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 9.

[d] *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 2. [e] *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 13. [f] *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 13-15.

[g] *Apol. Maj.* c. 26. Καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ κυρίου εἰς οὐρανὸν προβάλοντο οἱ δαίμονες ἀνθρώπους τινάς, λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι θεούς· οὓς οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἠδικήθησαν ὑφ' ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τιμῶν ἠξιώθησαν· Σίμωνα μέν τινα Σαμαρέα τὸν ἀπὸ κώμης λεγομένης Γίττων, ὃς ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος διὰ τῆς τῶν ἐνεργούντων δαιμόνων τέχνης δυνάμεις μαγικὰς ποιήσας ἐπὶ τῇ πόλει ὑμῶν τῇ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ θεὸς ἐνομίσθη καὶ ἀνδριάντι παρ' ὑμῶν ὡς θεὸς τετιμηται, ὃς ἀνδριὰς ἀνηγόρευται ἐν τῷ Τίβερι ποταμῷ μεταξὺ τῶν δύο γεφυρῶν, ἔχων ἐπιγραφὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν ταύτην ΣΙΜΩΝΙ ΔΕΩ ΣΑΓΚΤΩ, ὅτε ἐπὶ Σίμωνι θεῷ ἀγέφ. κ.τ.λ.—'And after the ascension of our Lord into heaven, the demons suborned certain men who said they were gods. These were not only not persecuted by you, but

Digitized by Google

almost universally admitted,[h] that Justin was mistaken, and that the statue which he supposed to have been raised in honour of Simon Magus was in reality dedicated to the Sabine god Semo Sancus.[i] This mistake is the less to be wondered at in this Father, since as a Greek he may be supposed not to have been very conversant with the local Roman deities. His statement, however, seems to have laid the foundation for all that is told about Simon's doings in Rome, as well as for the legend regarding his combat there with Peter, who in the Clementines appears as victorious over Simon Magus in Rome, as the Acts tell us he was in Samaria.[k] Eusebius, by adopting this unfounded story and by receiving as true the date which Justin gives in the words ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου, was shut up to the conclusion that Peter arrived at Rome during the reign of Claudius.[m] But what ground had Eusebius for placing Peter's arrival in Rome in the *second* year of Claudius? He does so because he makes the Apostle set out for Rome immediately after his imprisonment by Agrippa (Acts xii. 3-17). This is the earliest possible date that the narrative in Acts will admit of for his journey to Rome; and though Luke's words—'he went into another place'—will hardly bear this interpretation, still they are so vague as not to give a direct contradiction to this view. Eusebius made this imprisonment contemporaneous with the great famine foretold by Agabus, identifying it with that mentioned by Dio, lx. 11, as coming to pass in the second year of Claudius Cæsar.

If, however, we attend to the exact tenor of the language used by Eusebius, we see that his view must be based upon some earlier tradition which he merely modified in certain particulars.

---

but were even thought worthy of being honoured. Simon, a certain Samaritan of the village called Gitton, was one of the number who, in the reign of Claudius Cæsar, having performed many magical works by the aid of demons in your imperial city of Rome, was reckoned a god, and was honoured by you with a statue as a god on the river Tiber, between the two bridges, having the inscription in Latin SIMONI DEO SANCTO, which is "to Simon the Holy God." '

[h] Valesius on Eusebius, *in loco*; Hug, *Einleitung*, ii. 69 *sqq.*; Gieseler, *Kirchenges.*, i. 1. 64 (English, i. 49), and many others.

[i] Singularly enough, the statue which Justin seems to have seen was found in the Tiber in 1574, close to the place mentioned by him. It bears the following inscription:—

SEMONI SANCO DEO. FIDIO SACRUM, etc.
SACRED TO SEMO SANCUS THE FAITHFUL GOD, etc.

[k] Our oldest information regarding the doings of Simon in Rome and his death there, is derived from *Constit. Apost.*, vi. 9; Arnobius, ii. 12; Clemens Alexandr. *ap.* Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 14.

[m] The circumstance of Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 15, understanding the Babylon mentioned in 1 Pet. v. 13, to mean Rome, could not have been his reason for making Peter come to Rome during the reign of Claudius, for there is internal evidence that this epistle must have been written at a much later period. We shall afterwards see that he had other motives for this.

We

Digitized by Google

We have seen that Eusebius makes the first year of Linus, Bishop of Rome, contemporaneous with the death of the Apostle, that is in 68 A.D. Strangely enough, we find in the Chronicon the statement that Linus held this office in the eleventh year of Nero's reign, or 65 A. D., while still more singular is the statement in the Armenian version that Peter came to Rome as early as the third year of Caius, or 39 A. D. The two statements, however, correspond with and help to explain each other; for if we count the 25 years which Peter is said to have laboured in Rome, as beginning in the year 39 A. D., we get 64 A. D. as the year of his death, and 65 A. D. as the first year of Linus. We find the grounds of this combination indicated in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius. There at ii. 16-18, he gives it as a tradition (λόγος ἔχει) that the Egyptian Jew, Philo, on account of the Christian tenor of his writings, with which the Apostle must have been acquainted, and as the Alexandrian Christians mentioned by him (though he speaks only of the Egyptian Therapeutæ, whom the Fathers erroneously accounted Christians), were disciples of Mark, the ἑρμηνεύτης Πέτρου, 'interpreter of Peter,' had an interview with Peter in Rome. Eusebius was aware that Philo went to Rome as an ambassador from the Jews to Caius, and in his Chronicon he gives as the date of his arrival there the third year of this emperor.[n] But as he had already stated that Peter did not come to Rome till the reign of Claudius, he follows the story which had in consequence arisen, that Philo remained in Rome till after Claudius ascended the throne for the purpose of reading to the assembled Roman Senate the memorial presented to Caius,[o] and that the consequence of this was, that the Senate, struck with admiration, ordered it to be placed among the public records.[p] The original story of Philo's interview with the Apostle Peter in Rome, which, if well founded, must have taken place in 39 A. D., has, when divested of its modification by Eusebius, this to recommend it, that it correctly fixes upon 64 A. D. as the year of Peter's death. In all probability, too, it was this that gave rise to the opinion entertained by Eusebius and Jerome that Peter presided over the Church in Rome for 25 years; for 25 years added to 39 A. D., which we look upon as the *terminus a quo* of the reckoning, bring us to 64 A. D. The supporters of the original story, as well as Eusebius, conceived that Peter set out for Rome immediately after his imprisonment mentioned in Acts xii.; they, however, made this imprisonment contemporaneous with the prophecy of Agabus as to the famine, while the famine

[n] This is quite correct, as that embassy arrived in Rome during the winter of 39-40 A.D. See Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, in the year 40.

[o] Entitled *De Virtutibus*, or, as it is sometimes called, *De Legatione ad Caium.*

[p] *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 17, 18.

itself

Digitized by Google

itself they, in consequence of the particle καὶ before ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου in Acts xi. 28—'which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar,'—imagined began as early as the reign of Caius. This view has in modern times been held by Basnage, Bengel, Semler and others; but see Wieseler's *Chron. der Apost. Zeitalt.*, p. 156. But the statement that Peter laboured in Rome for 25 years is not the only one we meet with. In the Armenian version of the Chronicon and in the Milan edition of Samuel Aniensis we find it stated that Peter laboured in Rome for 20 years. This, too, is reckoned from Peter's imprisonment; with this difference, however, that this event is in this case correctly placed in the same year as the death of Agrippa (Acts xii. 17-24), or in the fourth of Claudius or 44 A. D. If, then, to this we add *twenty* years, we again obtain 64 A. D. as the year of Peter's death. It must, we think, be abundantly evident from the foregoing investigation that these computations of Eusebius, according to which Peter came to Rome in the beginning of the reign of Claudius, are destitute of all historical value. We hope in the following remarks to be able to give a negative as well as a positive proof of the accuracy of our conclusion in regard to Peter's residence and labours in Rome.

Not only is it impossible that Peter can have been in Rome *continuously* from the second year of the reign of Claudius, because about 50 A. D. we meet him at the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv.), and fourteen years after the conversion of Paul, about 54 A. D., we find him again in Jerusalem (Galat. ii. 1-10), from whence he went to Antioch (Galat. ii. 11-15), but *he cannot have been in Rome at all before the beginning of the reign of Nero in October* 54 A. D. For we find Paul (Galat. ii. 7-9), in speaking of the meeting he had with the Apostles James and Peter and John in Jerusalem about Pentecost 54 A. D., saying: 'but contrariwise, when they (judging from the successful results which I had communicated to them, ver. 2) saw that the Gospel of (preaching to) the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the Gospel of the circumcision was to Peter,—for he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles;—and when James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be (were esteemed as) pillars, perceived the grace given unto me (namely that capability so richly blessed by God of labouring among the heathen), they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands (as signs) of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.' It is evident from these verses that up to the year 54 A. D. when Nero began to reign, Peter had laboured with great success principally among the circumcision, as Paul had done among the heathen. The Church in Rome, therefore, cannot have

Digitized by Google

have belonged to this sphere of labour (Rom. i. 5, 6, 13, *et freq.*). Nay, the verses referred to prove far more than this. Peter, James, and John from that time took upon them as their special duty the apostleship of the circumcision, in proof of which at a later period we meet Peter in Babylon on the Euphrates, 1 Peter v. 13. Upon the whole, then, it may be assumed as proved that Peter and John—in regard to the latter of whom tradition speaks of labours in some of the places visited at an earlier period by Paul, in which the Jews did not preponderate—did not deviate from that agreement made with Paul until it had become unnecessary and untenable in consequence of his long imprisonment, and after his death. Indeed, Lactantius, who was a contemporary of, but somewhat older than Eusebius, and himself born in Italy, expressly says that Peter did not visit Rome till during the reign of Nero.[q]

Nor can Peter have been in Rome up till the date of Paul's arrival there in the spring of 61 A.D. About the time that Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Peter had no fixed place of abode, for from 1 Cor. ix. 5 we conclude that he was then busily engaged in going about from place to place preaching. When Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans in 58 A.D., Peter cannot have had his residence in Rome, for among the numerous salutations to Christians belonging to or residing in Rome which occur in Rom. xvi., we find no greeting to this Apostle, who surely would not have been passed over unnoticed. He cannot, therefore, up till the time of Paul's imprisonment, have made Rome the field of his missionary labours, for even in 54 A.D. they had fixed the bounds of their respective missionary fields. We may therefore at once conclude that a place lying so far to the westward as Rome, was entrusted to Paul, who, as a Roman citizen, doubtless looked upon it as on this account a peculiarly appropriate sphere for his labours, and to Barnabas, with all the greater readiness, that its population were chiefly Gentiles, and that Paul had for many years felt a desire to visit it (Rom. xv. 23). If, however, Peter had previously preached in Rome, Paul would hardly, in accordance with the principles he had already laid down in 2 Cor. x. 13-17, and Rom. xv. 20, 21, relating to the manner of sharing missionary labours, have announced in the Epistle to the Romans his intention of soon visiting this city. Further, from Acts xxviii. 22 we may draw the

[q] *De Mort. Persecut. Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit et editis quibusdam miraculis, quæ virtute ipsius Dei data sibi ab eo potestate faciebat, convertit multos ad justitiam, Deoque templum fidele ac stabile posuit.*—'When Nero was occupying the imperial throne, Peter came to Rome, and having there wrought certain miracles, which he performed by the aid of God himself, through power imparted unto him, turned many to righteousness, and established a church permanent and faithful to God.'

inference

Digitized by Google

inference, that, when Paul arrived in Rome in the spring of 61 A.D., Peter could not have been there previously. For we see by this passage, not merely that Luke does not give the slightest hint in the Acts of any meeting between Peter and Paul in Rome, but also that the chief of the Jews there seem to have known almost nothing of the nature of the doctrines of Christianity. This fact itself is sufficient, not merely to demolish the numerous legends with which the narrative of Paul's earlier labours in Rome is embellished, but even to disprove the very fact of any such labours, as the residence of an Apostle like Peter could hardly have remained so unnoticed, especially by the chiefs of the synagogue, into which this Apostle would, in consequence of his whole historical position, undoubtedly have sought admission.

Peter cannot have been in Rome during the period in which Paul wrote the Epistles appertaining to his confinement in Rome, that is, till after the end of the summer of 63 A.D., *when he composed his last Epistle, the Second to Timothy.* We possess Epistles of Paul written at various dates during his confinement, which extended from the spring of 61 A.D. till the end of the summer of 63 A.D. He does not, however, in a single one of them, give the slightest hint of the presence or of the labours of Peter. In the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, we have a detailed list of the names of individuals who send salutations, but the name of Peter is not there. Nay, in Coloss. iv. 10, 11, he mentions by name his fellow-workers in the Gospel who are of the 'circumcision,' among whom is Mark; yet here, too, Peter is not spoken of. In the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 21, 22) we have again salutations without any mention of Peter, who, even if the others had not been named, ought, on account of his apostolic position, to have been specially alluded to. Indeed, it is evident from ch. ii. 19-24, that at the time this Epistle was written, the Apostle looked upon Timothy as decidedly the most useful and most efficient of his fellow-workers; while finally in 2 Tim. iv. 9-22, i. 15-18, we have a great number of personal notices and a detailed list of those who send salutations, but not a word of Peter. When Paul felt so forsaken, what comfort would the presence and advice of Peter have afforded him? It is utterly inconceivable that Paul could, during this period, have written in the terms he has done, if Peter had been then with him in Rome. To this we may add, that Peter, when his first Epistle was written—which must be placed in this period, and probably about 62 A.D.—was at Babylon on the Euphrates.

Peter must have come to Rome some time between the end of summer 63 A.D. *and the time of his martyrdom during the Neronian persecution. The whole period of his labours there could not, therefore,*

Digitized by Google

fore, have extended to a year complete. As the martyrdom of the two Apostles Peter and Paul took place nearly at the same time, there is no reason why we should deny the credibility of the witnesses quoted above (p. 16) when they speak of the two Apostles as labouring in Rome at the same time. This, however, must have been but of short duration. According to Dionysius of Corinth, Peter seems to have visited Corinth on his way from the East to Rome. Nor have we any reason to doubt this statement, for Corinth, which was a seaport, lay in the direct route. Though these ancient witnesses, moreover, for the most part mention only the labours of Peter at Rome and his subsequent martyrdom, without expressly declaring the length of his residence there, yet Tertullian intimates what was his opinion on the subject. For in his *Apolog.*, § 5,[r] he says: 'Consult your own annals; there you will find that Nero was the first who as Emperor persecuted this sect *then beginning to flourish very greatly at Rome.*' If the Christian Church in Rome was really increasing more than it had ever before done, at the very time that Nero began his persecution against it, it follows that it must have existed there previously, though of course in a more obscure condition. Tertullian, therefore, places the date of its obtaining a firmer footing there during the period of the labours of the two Apostles Peter and Paul, which immediately preceded the breaking out of the persecution. It is instructive to remark how even Eusebius seeks to do away with the force of this passage of Tertullian which tells so strongly against his views. In his *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 25 we find him rendering it as follows:[s] 'Consult your own annals: there you will find that Nero was the first that persecuted this sect, when, especially in Rome, having subdued all the East, he was cruel towards all.' It will be seen that he here paraphrases the words *tum maxime Romæ orientem,* which were at variance with his chronological views, in such a way that, strange to say, he refers the *orientem* to Nero,[t] and makes *maxime* qualify Rome, as if Nero had at some earlier period persecuted in some other place. This, too, will explain Eusebius's addition, τὴν ἀνατολὴν πᾶσαν ὑποτάξας, 'having subdued all the East.' This paraphrase of Eusebius contains, moreover, the germ of the principles which he employs in determining the date of the Neronian persecution, and which we find in other passages

[r] *Consulite commentarios vestros: illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc sectam* TUM MAXIME ROMÆ ORIENTEM *Cesariano gladio ferocisse.*

[s] Ἐντύχετε τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν ὑμῶν. Ἐκεῖ εὑρήσετε πρῶτον Νέρωνα τοῦτο τὸ δόγμα, ἐνίκα μάλιστα ἐν Ῥώμῃ, τὴν ἀνατολὴν πᾶσαν ὑποτάξας ἀμὸς ἦν τοῖς πᾶσιν, διώξαντα.

[t] See also, in opposition to this, the parallel passage in Tertullian, *Scorpiace,* c. 15; *orientem fidem Romæ primus Nero cruentavit*—'Nero was the first who persecuted the faith springing into existence at Rome.'

of

Digitized by Google

of his works elaborated to suit his peculiar chronological system. According to him, Nero was then 'cruel to all,' and he had at that time succeeded in subduing the whole East. This we know was not the case till the arrival of Tiridates in Rome in 66 A.D.[u] Further, Origen[x] makes Peter's martyrdom almost contemporaneous with his first arrival in Rome.

In conclusion, we shall now inquire what relation the results at which we have arrived in regard to Peter's residence in Rome, bear to the dogmatic foundation for the claim preferred by the Bishop of Rome to the primacy over the Roman Catholic Church. This claim is founded on the assumption that as Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, the primacy committed to him by Christ devolved[y] at his death on his *successors as such*, in the Roman See. This position rests upon two assertions: *first*, that the Apostle Peter actually received from Christ the primacy over the whole Christian Church, including the other Apostles; and that till the time of his death, he, wherever he was, governed the whole of Christendom as the *Vicarius Christi;* and *secondly*, that he was empowered to make over this power intrusted to him as an Apostle, and that he did actually make it over to his successor in the See of Rome for the time being, because he was himself the first Bishop of Rome, and died there. Both these assertions are destitute of historical foundation; indeed, they were *bonâ fide* added for the express purpose of giving an *ex post facto* dogmatic justification of a state of matters which had arisen at an after period. When, however, we examine into the support which history gives to these assertions, we find that they fall to the ground as utterly untenable.

In support of the assertion that Christ himself, during his sojourn on earth, committed to Peter the primacy over his church,

---

[u] Dio, lxiii. 1-6; Sueton. *Nero*, c. 13; Plin. *Hist. Nat.* xxxiii. 3. See also Clinton, *Fasti Romani. ap.* 66 A.D.

[x] *Ap.* Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 1. Πέτρος δὲ ἐν Πόντῳ, καὶ Γαλατίᾳ, καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ, Καππαδοκίᾳ τε καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κεκηρυχέναι τοῖς ἐν διασπορᾷ Ἰουδαίοις, ἔοικεν· ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξίωσας παθεῖν. — 'Peter appears to have preached in Pontus, and Galatia, and Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia, to the Jews scattered abroad. He also at last, being in Rome, was crucified with his head downwards, having himself thought it fit that he should suffer in this way.'

[y] Phillipps *Kirchenrecht, Band* 1, p. 147 *seq.* He here quotes the words of the General of the Dominicans at the Council of Florence:—*Ex quo* (from Christ's address to Peter) *patet, quod Sedes Petri et Romana Ecclesia dicitur habere primatum ratione Petri, quia per hoc quod dixit: Tu es Petrus, &c., omnis potestas derivatur in sedem Apostolicam per* SUCCESSIONEM *sedentium in ea*—'From which it is evident that the chair of Peter and the Roman Church is said to have the primacy *by reason of Peter*, because the Lord having said "Thou art Peter," etc., all power appertains to the Apostolical chair, and *by succession* to those occupying it.'

his

Digitized by Google

his own words, as recorded in Matthew xvi. 18, 19, are especially adduced: 'And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'[2] It must, of course, be at once admitted that the word Πέτρος cannot be simply the mark of these words being addressed to Simon Peter; we have but to substitute for it the name Σίμων to see how inadmissible this supposition is. Indeed, from the context we see that Πέτρος forms an antithesis to the Σίμων βὰρ Ἰωνᾶ of verse 17. The word Πέτρος here denotes the new, spiritual man, which the old Simon had already by the operation of the Spirit of Christ become, and which he would every day become more and more. But it is to act in a way opposed to the laws of history, as well as calculated to produce inextricable confusion, if, arguing from this passage and even admitting that it does say something to this purport—a point we shall afterwards investigate—we *à priori* assume that the surname which Peter received as a citizen of Christ's kingdom, points *him* out as the rock of Christ's church. Simon had, long before these words were spoken, received from our Lord the surname of Peter; for—to adopt a date admitted by all who have sought to arrange in chronological order the Gospel narrative—all the Evangelists represent these words as not having been spoken till after the choosing of the twelve Apostles (Matth. xvi. 13-28, and x. 1-4; Mark viii. 27-ix. 1, and iii. 13-19; Luke ix. 18-27, and vi. 12-16); before which time Peter bore this honourable name (Matth. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14). Indeed, he received it as early as the period referred to in John i. 43; whilst the words under consideration could not have been spoken till more than a year afterwards (John vi. 66-69). In order, then, to investigate the true meaning of this surname, we must confine ourselves to what we find recorded in John i. 43. The Lord calls him, after he had earnestly looked on him (ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ), and speaking in Aramaic כֵּיפָא, that is, 'a rock,' the Greek for which is Πέτρος, itself another form of the more common πέτρα.[3] The

[2] Κἀγὼ δὲ σοι λέγω, ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς. Καὶ δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

[3] The masculine form Πέτρος seems to have been chosen because it was employed to characterize a man. This form, too, elsewhere occurs as a name. (Pape *Handwört.*, ii. 574.) The distinction usually made between πέτρος and πέτρα—viz., that the former means a stone, and the latter the whole rock—can hardly

Digitized by Google

The symbolic surname of 'a rock' must, undoubtedly, be understood as referring to the *firmness*[b] and immoveableness which would be displayed by Simon in his new character[c] as a citizen of the kingdom of heaven.[d] Indeed, this may be discovered in the confession with which, according to John i. 42, his brother Andrew brought him to Christ, 'we have found the Messias.' But the text affords us not the slightest ground for maintaining that that surname bore any reference to any authority to be exercised by Peter over the Church; for in this case he would not have been called simply 'a rock,' but 'the rock of the Church.' As a rule, too, *all* the surnames of the Apostles refer to *personal* gifts and *personal* qualities. Thus the two sons of Zebedee are called Sons of Thunder (Mark iii. 17); another Apostle Simon Ζηλωτὴς[e] (Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13); while Judas is called the Traitor (Luke vi. 16; Matthew x. 4; Mark iii. 19). This, then, is the way we must understand the word Πέτρος in Matth. xvi. 18, as is evident from the context. The three first Evangelists, in narrating the circumstances that led to the conversation in which these words occurred, state that our Lord asked his disciples 'Whom do men say that I am?' Whereupon they answering, said, 'Some say thou art John the Baptist, some Elias, some Jeremias, or one of the old prophets;' in short, in his humiliation they took him for everything but for the Messiah, the Son of God (Matth. xvi. 13, 14; Mark viii. 27, 28; Luke ix. 18, 19). But when Jesus said unto them, Whom say ye that I am? Simon Peter answered, and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God (Matt. xvi. 15, 16; Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20). Thus did he remain firm to his former confession, and thus did he prove himself to be the rock which Christ had formerly called him. Therefore did the Saviour[f] go on to say, Thou art PETER. It is evident,

---

hardly be attended to in the rendering of the passage, as the sense attached to the word Πέτρος must be that borne by the Aramaic ܟܐܦܐ, *Kephas*.

[b] In this sense the figure is very common, indeed it occurs even in classic authors, as in Homer, Od. xvii. 463, ὁ δ' ἰστάθη ἤύτε πέτρη ἰμαιδὸν, 'He stood firmly as a rock.'

[c] See Olshausen *in loco* (English, ii. 219 *sq.*).—*Tr.*

[d] Simon was at first no rock, but, as our Lord foresaw (John ii. 24, 25), he would become more and more so through the grace of God, who had already begun a good work in him. And so it was. We find the Apostle, for example, in Matt. xvi. 16, and parallel passages, giving a testimony of his belief in Christ; and though, on a later occasion, at the trial of Christ where he was present, he flinched in the hour of danger and denied the Lord, yet soon after this fall he was, with tears of bitter repentance, established anew in the faith, which amid heavy toil and labour, and among great dangers (Acts iii. 1-4, 22; v. 17-41; xii. 3-17), he held fast until he suffered a martyr's death.

[e] Ὁ καναναῖος, which we find in Matt. x. 4, Mark iii. 19, bears the same meaning. It is derived from ܩܢܐ, to be zealous.

[f] I would translate our Lord's previous words (ver. 17) thus: 'Blessed art thou, because

Digitized by Google

evident, moreover, from the form in which the narrative is given in John[g] (ch. vi. 66-71), that special prominence is given to the firmness of his faith. In the Gospel of this Evangelist the narrative is, it is true, shorter; but its essential import has been accurately preserved by an eye-witness. Jesus says to the twelve, when many of his disciples had gone back and walked no more with him, 'Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And *we* believe and are sure that thou art Christ the Son of God.' The meaning of the words is so clear that it is unnecessary to add anything further. It is evident, too, that Peter made this confession, not in *his own name* merely, but also in that of the *twelve*[h]—the traitor Judas, of course, excepted, as we see from John vi. 70, 71. The narrative of the other three Evangelists is at variance with this only in form. For though Peter speaks here in the singular, it cannot be denied that in the Gospels we often find Peter speaking for the others. In addition to this, we see from Matthew, Mark, and Luke, that, in point of fact, Christ's question was put, not to Peter only, but to *all* the Apostles (Matth. xvi. 15; Mark viii. 29; Luke ix. 20), while immediately thereafter the instructions of our Lord, which

because flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee (that is, no mere man, for in that case it would be a mere historical faith, which would not stand the trial; it would not be a faith founded on a rock), but my Father which is in heaven' (see in illustration Gal. i. 15-17). As Peter here expresses no new truth, the revelation spoken of by Christ must be referred to the time when Simon first confessed him to be the Christ (John i. 42, 43). The flesh and blood, which would have revealed to him this truth, must be understood primarily of his brother Andrew, who, at that time, brought him to the Messias; and as Jesus (ver. 17) recurs to his first eventful meeting with Peter, it was no more than was to be expected that he should (ver. 18) mention and give prominence to the name then conferred on him.

[g] For the proof that we have here a chronological parallel, see Wieseler's *Chronol. Synop. der Vier Evangelien*, p. 277.

[h] We must not from the circumstance that Peter often appears as spokesman (see, however, John xiii. 24, 25) draw any conclusion as to his higher spiritual position and gifts. For this there were probably many natural reasons, as, for example, his temperament, his age, etc. (Peter seems to have been at that time the only married man among the apostles, Matt. viii. 14, 15, and *Parall.*). We may see from the case of the Apostle James, the son of Alpheus, what an influence age and the experience that accompanies it can give. From the Gospels we see that this Apostle during our Lord's lifetime remained quite in the background—a circumstance which must be attributed to his extreme youth (he is called in Mark xv. 40, ὁ μικρός, 'the less'); and yet at a later period, as we learn from Acts xii. 17, he was one of the most distinguished Apostles, and was the chief man in the Mother Church at Jerusalem (see Dr. Wieseler's article in the *Theol. Stud. und Kritik.* 1842; '*Ueber die Brüder des Herrn im Unterschiede von den Söhnen Alphäi*,' *u.s.w.*). But such natural qualifications are of a temporary and transitory nature, and are not therefore calculated to determine the permanent position of an individual in Christ's kingdom. In making these remarks, however, we do not wish in the slightest degree to detract from Peter's actual spiritual importance and position.

presuppose

Digitized by Google

presuppose on the part of all of them a confession of him, and which were delivered immediately after, were expressly addressed to all the Apostles (Matth. xvi. 20-28; Mark viii. 30-38; Luke ix. 21-27). It was not Peter only, but also all the other Apostles, who, in answer to Christ's question, professed the constancy of their faith in him. The only question, therefore, is, whether from Matth. xvi. 18, 19, and especially from the words καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, 'and upon this rock,' we must infer that a new grace was committed by Christ to Peter, and, in this case, whether it was one that appertained to him exclusively, without any of the other Apostles sharing therein.

This opinion has been maintained on the ground that the words πέτρα αὕτη refer to the Apostle Simon Peter. In this case, this Apostle would be designated as the foundation, and—as it is commonly expressed—the central point on which Christ sought to raise the edifice of his Church. But even if this were the correct interpretation of the words, and though we could not adduce a similar expression of Christ respecting any of the other Apostles, still it would not follow as a necessary consequence, that the primacy over all other believers, including the Apostles, was committed to Peter; for as he answered only in the name of all the Apostles, the words of Christ, notwithstanding their being addressed to Peter, might also bear reference to them all. But such an interpretation of the words of Matthew is hardly admissible. For, in the first place, the proper name Πέτρος would, in that case, require to be understood in a sense totally different from that in which it must originally have been employed by Christ. If we explain it by the word πέτρα, which occurs in the subsequent clause, then it follows that Simon is here called Πέτρος because he was to prove the immoveable foundation of the Christian Church; whilst we have already seen (p. 27) that he is called by Christ a rock, because he personally would be firm in his faith on Christ. This latter interpretation seems to be the only one that harmonizes with the context. In the *second* place, the Evangelist himself, by his use of the two different words Πέτρος and πέτρα, indicated plainly enough that our view is the correct one; for had he intended to convey the impression that the idea expressed by the two words was identical, he would have said, σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν πέτρον κ. τ. λ., 'Thou art Peter, and upon this stone,' etc. But the circumstance of his using the masculine form plainly enough shows that he is speaking of the *personal* rock Simon (p. 27). When, therefore, in contrast to this he employs the feminine form, he must be understood as meaning a material rock: which is, as we learn from v. 16 and 17, that testimony sealed in the heart by God, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. In the *third* place,

Digitized by Google

place, if the words ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ had been specially addressed to Peter, we should have expected some such phrase as ἐπὶ σέ or ἐπὶ σέ, τὴν πέτραν, 'upon thee,' or 'upon thee, the rock.' Since the rock is here spoken of in the third person, we must thence conclude that the Evangelist is here referring to another rock, which must be distinguished from the personal rock, Simon Peter, who is addressed, and of which, of its more exalted and eternal origin, he speaks in v. 18. In the *fourth* place, while it is impossible to find in the whole Scriptures any idea at all analogous to that which we must understand this passage to convey, if it means that Christ will build his Church upon the rock Peter (See Ephes. ii. 20; Revel. xxi. 14, 19, 20), the view which we maintain may be said to be the fundamental idea of the Bible (John xvii. 3: Rom. x. 9; 1 Cor. iii. 11, etc.). So long as the Church adheres to this confession, the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it; it shall be victorious over death, and over the formerly invincible gates of Hades, which also shall gather its members together, for it is Christ that hath the keys of Hades and of death (Rev. i. 18). Yea, it is faith and the joyful confession of this faith that overcome the world and death. At all events, it is plain that the use of the word πέτρα was the consequence of the employment of the name Πέτρος. There is a play of words in the distinction between the personal and the material rock, each of which by its nature is calculated to aid and promote the welfare of the Christian Church. This they do in different ways: the latter being its eternal foundation, the former a labourer for a time in its cause. But further, the opinion that the words πέτρᾳ ταύτῃ cannot refer to the Apostle Peter, was very commonly entertained by the Fathers, as even Klee[1] himself is compelled to admit. On the whole, then, the opinion that in Matth. xvi. 18 any prerogative distinct from the other Apostles, much less that any primacy, was committed to Peter by Christ, must be abandoned as untenable.

In Matthew xvi. 19, we have next a promise to Peter, δώσω σοι κ. τ. λ., 'I will give to thee,' etc. The question, then, is, whether here at least there is not some privilege bestowed by Christ upon Peter superior to those given to the other Apostles. According to the context the reason for this promise was, that as Peter had by his public and joyful profession of faith in Christ shown himself to be a rock in regard to that which is the eternal foundation of the Church of Christ, so it was right that he should be intrusted

[1] *Cathol. Dogmat.*, i. 161. This writer, who does not belong to the more unscrupulous class of Catholic dogmatic authors, gives us anything but a strictly historical and exegetical proof of the reality of the Popish primacy; on the contrary, we have in his work little but a careful collection of quotations from Fathers of the most diverse periods, and partly of the most opposite opinions. This is the way he seeks to support the system now predominant in the Romish Church.

Digitized by Google with

with the office of a steward of the mysteries of the kingdom, 'And I will give unto thee (at an after period, after my departure) the keys of the kingdom of heaven,'—that is, the keys which serve to procure admission to the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven; or, to speak without a figure, the power of dispensing, as my minister, the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven. It is the keys of knowledge that are here spoken of, which open the entrance to the kingdom of heaven. These keys were, under the Old Testament dispensation, held by the lawyers (Luke xi. 52);[k] under the New Testament dispensation they were to be borne by Peter. It is hardly admissible to understand the phrase, 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' in any other way than in accordance with the Rabbinical phraseology then current among the Jews, as well as among the disciples to whom our Lord here speaks; while in regard to the words δεῖν and λύειν, 'to bind' and 'to loose,' which occur immediately afterwards, there can be no doubt that in their interpretation we must avail ourselves of the Rabbinical terminology. This is confirmed by the sense of the succeeding words, which contain an amplification of the preceding promise made to Peter. The connection is as follows: 'I will give unto thee the power in my name to administer the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven,—in this way that whatsoever thou (in virtue of this power of the keys) shalt bind (forbid) on earth shall be bound (forbidden) in heaven (by God), and whatsoever thou shalt loose (permit) on earth shall be loosed in heaven (by God)'. That the words δεῖν and λύειν must be here understood as referring to Peter's legislative power[m] (derived from the possession of the key of knowledge) in the kingdom of heaven cannot be doubted when we take into consideration the sense attached by the Rabbins to the words אסר and התיר.[n] And as we should, *à priori*, expect that Christ did not by these words intend to commit any exclusive authority to Peter,—for he gave this power to him because he had stood fast on the eternal rock of the Gospel, which however the other

[k] This verse is to be translated as follows: 'Woe unto you, lawyers! because you have taken away the key of knowledge (the lawyers plumed themselves far too much on the circumstance of the key of knowledge being intrusted to them) (John vii. 48, 49); 'even ye yourselves' (despite of that key) 'have not entered (into the kingdom), and them that were entering ye have hindered.' Other parallel passages, which, though not precisely so, serve to explain the figurative use of the word κλεῖς, are Isa. xxii. 22; Rev. i. 18; iii. 7; ix. 1.

[m] It would be altogether erroneous were we, in consequence of the difficulty of the passage, simply to adopt John xx. 23 as our guide, and understand the power of the keys spoken of in our passage as referring to the remission and retaining of sins; for δεῖν and λύειν cannot have this meaning (Fritzsche and Meyer *in loco*). Even this assumption, however, would not overthrow our view, since even in this case it would be clear that no privilege is here promised to Peter in which all the other Apostles are not sharers.

[n] Lightfoot *in loco*.

Digitized by Google

Apostles had done as well as he,—so in Matthew xviii. 18 we find the power of binding and of loosing expressly intrusted to the other Apostles also (Matt. xiii. 11; Mark vi. 33, 34). *There is, then, no key belonging to Peter that is not, in accordance with the commandment of Christ, borne by the other Apostles also.*

It cannot, it is true, be denied that Peter was one of the most distinguished and most trusted of the disciples of Jesus; but he shared this pre-eminence with James and John, the two sons of Zebedee (Matt. xvii. 1; xxvi. 37; Mark ix. 1; xiv. 32; Luke ix. 28, &c.); indeed, John was the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who leant on Jesus' breast. From this, then, it is clear that we cannot deduce any proof of the primacy of Peter in the sense contended for by the Romish Church.*

We cannot see that Christ in any way bestowed upon Peter an exclusive function in his kingdom; nay, we look upon it as expressly stated that all power was committed to him *in common* with the other apostles and disciples (Matt. xviii. 18-21; John xx. 22, 23; Matt. xxviii. 18-20; see also Mark xvi. 16-18). And of how great importance would it have been, that an institution so necessary as some maintain the primacy of Peter to be for the salvation of the church, should have been earnestly and explicitly inculcated by Christ at his departure. It is somewhat singular that several sayings of our Lord, spoken towards the end of his life, but which evidently related to something totally different, are made by Popish writers to refer to this primacy. One of these is Luke xxii. 32. Here the Saviour is said to have prayed especially for Peter, that his faith should not fail, and to have given him the command that he should strengthen his brethren. But in their zeal they have utterly overlooked the original connection of the words. They are spoken by Christ when warning Peter that he would that very night deny him and his faith. He says to him that he had prayed for him that his faith should not fail, that is, with the act of denial, as is evident from the words σοτὲ ἐπιστρέψας, 'when thou art converted;' while the exhortation to strengthen his brethren in their temptations precedes the prophecy that he should himself fall. They next appeal to John xxi. 15-17, maintaining that Peter is

* As little can we draw any conclusion from the circumstance that Peter is named first in all the lists of the Apostles (Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13), and that in Matt. x. 2 he is expressly designated as πρῶτος, 'the first.' For that this must be understood of number and not of rank is perfectly evident from Mark iii. 16 and Acts i. 13, where, since regard is had at the same time to the importance of the Apostles during the time of Christ's ministry, the arrangement is as follows: Peter, James, John, Andrew—Peter being, for this reason, here separated from his brother Andrew. In this passage he is named first of the three most distinguished Apostles, because in the three first Gospels in which these lists occur, the calling of Peter and Andrew is mentioned as the earliest, while next is that of the sons of Zebedee (Matt. iv. 18-22; Mark i. 16-20; Luke v. 1-11).

there

Digitized by Google

there appointed by Christ pastor of the Christian Church, and that in xxi. 19 he is named 'follower of Christ,' (for thus they interpret ἀκολούθει μοι, 'follow me,') and consequently chief pastor. In opposition to this view, I will not urge the objection that this chapter was not written by John the Evangelist, for I look upon it as an authentic historical narrative.[p] But it is difficult to understand how Christ, in appointing Peter the shepherd of his sheep, should have given him any special prerogative; for in this, at least, all the Apostles participated. Nor can it make any difference in the matter that he has used this figure in regard to them, while Peter cannot have understood the words of Christ as conferring any personal pre-eminence; indeed as is expressly stated in John xxi. 17, 'he was grieved thereat' (ἐλυπήθη ὁ Πέτρος)[q]. In so far, however' as relates to the words 'follow me,' it is only by disjoining them, entirely from their original connection that we can so far misunderstand them as to hold that they do not refer to *following* in martyrdom. To be convinced of this we have to compare the parallel passage, 'follow thou me,' John xxi. 22, which stands in opposition to 'to tarry,' which again in ver. 23, is interpreted by 'not to die,' or the words 'but thou shalt follow me afterwards, in John xiii. 36.

From our investigation of the Gospels, then, we arrive at the conclusion that Peter was one of the most distinguished and most spiritually gifted of the Apostles even during the lifetime of Christ; but we find *no* ground for holding that any essential pre-eminence over the other Apostles in reference to the superintendence of the Church was bestowed upon him by Christ, or that our Lord committed to him the primacy of the Church and made him

[p] Dr. Wieseler, in a work entitled *Num loci Marc.* xvi. 9-20 *et John.* xxi., *genuini sint*, &c. Goett., 1839, maintains that these two passages were not written by the authors whose names they bear. He holds that John xxi. was written by the Presbyter John after the death of Peter and John.—*Tr.*

[q] He was thereby reminded that he had shortly before denied his Lord, who on this account seemed to doubt his love. The reference to this event, which many admit, is further demonstrated to be correct by the chronology of the narrative. This event took place the first time, after Peter had denied him, that our Lord had the opportunity of speaking confidentially to his disciples, and of tarrying with them. It was impossible, therefore, that he could permit this denial to pass by unpunished and unreproved. We hold then that the three questions of our Lord correspond with the three denials of Peter. The question 'lovest thou me more than these?' (John xxi. 15) corresponds with the presumptuous words which Peter's love impelled him to utter when Christ told him that he would deny him: 'though all shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended' (Mark xiv. 29; Matt. xxvi. 33); while, finally, as the three questions of Christ in John xxi. 15-19, appear to be connected with the prophecy of the martyrdom of Peter, the same is the case with the peculiar language in which Christ tells Peter of his denial of him (John xiii. 36-38). In short this passage contains nothing but an amplification of our Lord's words in Luke xxii 32; 'and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren,' made after and in consequence of Peter's denial. See Dr. Wieseler's above-mentioned work, p. 33.

Digitized by Google

its

its central point (Matt. xxiii. 7-10). For the proof of the correctness of this conclusion we need but refer to the history of the progressive development of the Church after the death of Christ, as we find this recorded in the New Testament.

In the Acts, at least as far as the 12th chapter, we find Peter one of the foremost in promoting the spread of Christianity. In Acts ix. 32 to xi. 18 especially, we see him actively and successfully prosecuting the missionary work. But there is not the slightest trace of any superintendence over the Church being exercised by him in the sense in which it is held by the Romish hierarchy (see Acts viii. 14). Indeed, at the apostolic council (Acts xv.), though Peter, Paul, and Barnabas declared in favour of the total freedom of the Gentile Christians, the intermediate proposal of James, the son of Alpheus, was adopted. In Galatians ii. 9, James, Peter, and John are accounted pillars of the Church; Peter is, we see, but one of these pillars, and James is named before him. It is perfectly evident, too, from Galatians ii. 12, that James, who seems to have been peculiarly distinguished for the χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως, possessed at that time a greater influence than Peter among the Jewish Christians; Paul, too, considered himself as not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. We find him at Antioch boldly withstanding Peter to the face[r] (Gal. ii. 11). In Gal. ii. 7 we find him drawing a parallel between the results of his own missionary labours and those of Peter; while in 1 Cor. xv. 10, he says that he had laboured more abundantly than they all. Peter himself in his first Epistle (v. 1) does not speak of himself as prince of the apostles or as chief shepherd of the whole church; he merely calls himself a fellow-elder (συμπρεσβύτερος), and a witness of the sufferings of Christ. The exaggerated representations of the effects produced by this blessed instrument in God's hand appear to have arisen, partly from an erroneous interpretation by later authors of the passages in the Gospels already referred to, and partly from the gradually increasing power and supremacy of the Romish church, which accounted this Apostle its founder, and which reckoned itself glorified by its connection with him. We have no desire to be ungrateful, and therefore, following the testimony of history and of truth, we shall give their due to the other apostles.

If, then, the primacy of the Bishop in Rome exists, to use the

[r] Many of the Fathers endeavoured to get quit of this stumbling-block—some by saying that the Cephas here mentioned and the Apostle Peter were different persons (Clem. Alex. *ap.* Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* i. 12), others by making the words κατὰ πρόσωπον refer to a merely apparent contradiction (Jerome, Chrysostom, Œcumenius, Theophylact, *in loco*). How little, too, are the decided words of Paul in Gal. i. 8, 9, in accordance with the idea of Peter's primacy! For no one can maintain that the matter in question referred merely to matters of discipline and to regulations, in regard to which the Primate might possibly be in error.

words

Digitized by Google

words of the General of the Dominicans (p. 26) *ratione Petri*, Peter, in order to have the power of conveying to his successors the primacy over the whole church, must have himself possessed it. This we have seen was not the case; though even if he had possessed it, a special proof would have been requisite to demonstrate that an apostolic prerogative bestowed upon him *individually* could be transferred by him to others. Nay, even if we were to admit this position, which cannot, however, be proved, it would further require to be demonstrated, that he actually conveyed to the *Roman* Church the primacy committed to him; for, as is well known, he laboured in other churches as well as there. In default of all other express proofs, the supporters of the papacy appeal to the circumstance that he laboured *last* at Rome, having been martyred there; and in support of the hierarchical system they add, that he was the first Bishop of Rome, and that *by succession* he conveyed the primacy to his successors in office. But, even admitting the correctness of the ideas regarding the constitution of the church on which this view is founded, it is a mere fiction that Peter was first Bishop of Rome, or that he was ever Bishop there at all. Even Eusebius, who tells so many fabulous stories about Peter's residence in Rome, says not a word about his having been Bishop of that place.[s] Indeed, if at that time there were Bishops at all, in the Romish sense of the term, Peter could not have been the first Bishop of Rome, as he did not visit that city till the very close of his life, and as he must, when he arrived there, in consequence of the Roman Church having been a considerable time in existence, and also of the long and successful labours of Paul there, have found a church already organized. Further, the Church of Rome was, in so far as regarded its origin, far more indebted to Paul than to Peter, who laboured there but a very short time. This relationship was at first gratefully acknowledged even by members of the Roman Church. We need but read what the oldest witness, Clemens Romanus, says in his Epistle to the Corinthians in regard to the end of the two Apostles, to see for which he entertains the greater affection.[t]

Irenæus

[s] Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 103, note 6 (English, i. 78, note 6).

[t] The following is the passage to which Wieseler here refers. We give it as conjecturally restored by Wotton, with some alterations by Wieseler himself:—*Πίστεως διὰ ζῆλον ἔδιωξεν οὐχ ἵνα οὐδὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπήνεγκεν πόνους καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. Διὰ ζῆλον ὁ Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ἐπέσχεν ἐπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας, φραγελλωθείς, λιθασθείς· κῆρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει τὸν γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν· δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δυσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον ἐπορεύθη, ὑπομονῆς γενόμενος μέγιστος ὑποτυπωτής.*—'Peter through unrighteous zeal underwent not one or two, but many labours, till at last having thus

Digitized by Google

Irenæus[u] says that Linus was ordained first Bishop of Rome by Peter and Paul. If, however, despite of all history, any are determined to abide by the opinion that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, it must be evident even to them that he could not have governed this church as the central point of the whole church, to which conclusion, however, the whole of the opposite argument tends: for Peter himself, shortly before his martyrdom, speaks of the Mother Church in Jerusalem and of Judea as the central point of Christianity, classing, as he does, all foreign churches, among which was Rome, under the term διασπορά,[x] 1 Pet. i. 1.

From what has been already said it must be abundantly clear that the Romish Papacy, which claims the primacy over the whole Church, is *not* an institution immediately appointed by Christ and based upon a foundation derived from the Gospels, but that it is one that arose at a later period under the influence of many co-operating causes, to enter upon a discussion of which here would not be in accordance with the object proposed in this Excursus.

---

thus testified he went to the place of glory due to him. Through zeal Paul obtained the reward of his patience, having been seven times in bonds, having been stoned, and having been scourged. Having preached both to the east and to the west, he received the suitable glory of his faith. Having, too, taught the whole world righteousness, and having come to the borders of the west, and having testified before the rulers, he departed out of the world and went to the holy place, having been a most eminent pattern of patience.'

[u] *Advers. Hær.* iii. 3. Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρησαν.—'The blessed Apostles having established and edified the Church, committed the charge of the bishopric to Linus.' Epiphanius, in his work *Ad. Hæres.*, xxxvii. 6, says:—ἐν Ῥώμῃ γὰρ γεγόνασι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι.—'For the Apostles Peter and Paul were themselves the first bishops in Rome.' The story that Peter was first bishop of Rome took its rise from the unhistorical *Clementines*, and was propagated throughout the Catholic Church by means of the *Recognitiones*, the remodelled form in which they were afterwards published (Gieseler, *Kirchengs.* i. 362 (English, i. 264).

[x] From this correct historical view, with which, however, there came in course of time to be connected Judaizing and hierarchical notions, as well as the idea that the Apostle James, the son of Alpheus, was bishop of Jerusalem, there was developed, in connection with the opposition to the Gospel preached by Paul, the conception of the Clementines, in which James appears as supreme bishop of all Christendom, with both the Bishop of Rome and the Apostle Peter subordinate to him.

THE

Digitized by Google

THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES.

CORPUS IGNATIANUM: *a complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles, genuine, interpolated, and spurious; together with numerous Extracts from them, as quoted by Ecclesiastical Writers, down to the Tenth Century; in Syriac, Greek, and Latin; an English Translation of the Syriac Text, copious Notes, and Introduction.* By WILLIAM CURETON, M.A., F.R.S., Chaplain in Ordinary to her Majesty the Queen [now Canon of Westminster]. London. Rivingtons, 1849.

IF any complaint should be made of want of attention in this country to critical studies, or if any doubt were cast on the existence of sound and accurate scholarship amongst us, we might point to this volume as a refutation of such aspersions. Mr. CURETON has laboured with remarkable success in impressing on his work the character of *completeness;* he has promised (it may be said) *much*, in the title of his volume; but however much may be expected, the contents will, we believe, fully answer all expectations.

It is very generally known by those who are acquainted even in the slightest degree with the subject of the Ignatian Epistles, that, for a long period, various doubts have been raised as to their genuineness; and, also, that both in Greek and Latin they have been transmitted to us in a longer and a shorter form,—and, farther, that besides *seven* Epistles mentioned by Eusebius as then bearing the name of Ignatius, *five* others have come down to us in Greek and Latin, and *three* in Latin only. Those who know at all the *recent* history of these Epistles, are also aware that Mr. Cureton published in 1845 *three* of them in a *Syriac version*, discovered by himself, in which the text is considerably shorter than the shorter of two Greek and Latin recensions.

The discovery and publication of the Syriac version has placed the controversies connected with these Epistles in an aspect wholly new. Those who had been accustomed to uphold the genuineness of seven Ignatian Epistles in their shorter form, have had to re-examine the grounds on which they received these Epistles, and these only, and that in this particular recension: while those who opposed the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles in general, have found a new element introduced into the questions,—a new subject for inquiry: and those who thought (as was the case with many of the most competent scholars) that the whole subject was involved

Digitized by Google

involved in obscurity and difficulty, have found in the Syriac text something tangible and intelligible. These considerations would suffice to indicate that Mr. Cureton's volume is at least important. He has in *this* publication not merely reprinted the Syriac Epistles with all the critical care which was practicable, but he has given the longer and shorter Greek and Latin texts (compared with the Syriac and with one another), and all the Epistles which, in any form, bear the name of Ignatius.

We now possess *three* collections of Epistles claiming to be those of Ignatius (exclusive of the three in Latin only, which are confessedly spurious). 1. A *larger* Greek and Latin text containing *twelve* Epistles in Greek and Latin; 2. A text of *eleven*[a] Epistles (bearing the same names as the same number of the former) in Greek and Latin, in which *seven* of the Epistles are in a shorter form; and 3. A Syriac text of *three* Epistles only, in which the epistles are still *shorter* than even the shorter Greek and Latin text.

We will now follow Mr. Cureton in giving as succinct a literary history as we can of the leading editions of these Epistles.

It must be borne in mind that after the invention of printing *criticism* was at first but little exercised. An editor published just what his MS. presented, and many works afterwards required much care and pains, both in the revision of the text and also in the more important province of rejecting writings which were wholly spurious. The first edition of any Epistles bearing the name of Ignatius, appears to have been in 1495, when two Epistles professedly from Ignatius to St. John the apostle, with one to the Virgin Mary, and one from her to Ignatius, were published at Paris, annexed to a life of Archbishop Becket.[b] In 1498 JACQUES LE FEVRE D'ETAPLES (*Faber Stapulensis*) published eleven *other* Epistles in Latin, bearing the name of Ignatius; these consist of the common collection, with the exception of that

[a] We call this a collection of *eleven* Epistles, because that is the number in the *Latin* copies. The Greek transcript is truncated; but we think it probable that *it* also did not contain the Epistle to the Philippians.

[b] The short forged letter from the Virgin Mary to Ignatius is not in Mr. Cureton's volume. This Epistle perhaps deserved a place as much (or as little) as the three Latin letters forged in the name of Ignatius. We give it from Petermann's edition:—'*Ignatio dilecto condiscipulo humilis ancilla Christi Jesu. De Jesu quæ à Johanne audisti et didicisti, vera sunt. Illa credas, illis inhæreas; et Christianitatis susceptæ votum firmiter teneas, et mores et vitam voto conformes. Veniam autem unâ cum Johanne, te et qui tecum sunt visere. Sta in fide et viriliter age, nec te commoveat persecutionis austeritas; sed valeat et exsultet spiritus tuus in Deo salutari tuo. Amen.*' Mr. Cureton, by a *lapsus manûs*, makes it appear as though this letter were addressed to St. John. 'A letter in the name of the Blessed Virgin herself to the disciple [of him] whom her Son the Lord loved.' By inserting these words in brackets, the erratum is corrected.

addressed

Digitized by Google

addressed to Maria of Cassobolita. In 1536 an edition of all the fifteen Latin Epistles was published at Cologne. From this various other editions were taken. In this collection an Epistle from Maria of Cassobolita to Ignatius is prefixed to one addressed to her.

In 1557 HARTUNG FRID (*Valentinus Paceus*) published at Dillingen from an Augsburg MS. the *Greek* text of the Ignatian Epistles. They were arranged in the following order:—1. to Maria of Cassobolita; 2. to the Trallians; 3. to the Magnesians; 4. to the Tarsians; 5. to the Philippians; 6. to the Philadelphians; 7. to the Smyrnæans; 8. to Polycarp; 9. to the Antiochians; 10. to Hero; 11. to the Ephesians; 12. to the Romans. This edition was made the basis of others, and also of a Latin translation. In 1560 another edition in Greek appeared, independent of that printed at Dillingen; this was taken from a MS. in the possession of Caspar von Nydpruck.

In the early part of the seventeenth century some discrimination began to be exercised as to the reception of these Epistles as genuine on critical grounds. MARTIALIS MÆSTRÆUS, in his edition (1608), assigned reasons for his reception of the twelve Epistles; and though these reasons were not satisfactory or conclusive, the subject was at least made a matter of inquiry. He also drew attention to the Greek text of the Epistles as not being in a pure and uninterpolated state. This latter opinion was acquiesced in by others who possessed learning and discrimination.

VEDELIUS, in 1623, went farther: he divided the Greek Epistles into two classes: he received as genuine seven Epistles which correspond to the *names* of those mentioned by Eusebius; the rest he regarded as spurious. He farther marked in the seven Epistles several passages which he considered to be spurious. In some respects he certainly exhibited a sagacity which has been wonderfully confirmed.

ARCHBISHOP USHER carried the investigations relative to the text of these Epistles still farther. Mr. Cureton thus describes his critical research on this subject:—

'He had observed that a passage cited by Theodoretus, Bishop of Cyrus, in the fifth century, as from the Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrnæans, was not found to exist in any of the Greek or Latin copies of those Epistles then published; but that a quotation similar to that made by Theodoretus, had been adduced by Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, in his Commentary on Pseudo-Dionysius, the Areopagite, about 1250, and by William Wodeford about 1396, and John Tissington, both in their writings against Wicliff. As all these three authors were Englishmen, the thought suggested itself to the learned

Digitized by Google

learned Archbishop, that the source from which these quotations were derived must once have been current in this country, and might probably be still in existence. Under this impression he instituted an inquiry, and had the gratification of discovering two copies of an ancient Latin translation of the Ignatian Epistles, one in the library of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and the other in the private collection of Richard Montacute (or Mountagu), Bishop of Norwich, in which the passage of the Epistle to the Smyrnæans was found to agree with the quotations made by those three authors, and with the Greek, as cited by Theodoretus.

'In these copies the Epistle to the Philippians was omitted, and the arrangement of the rest differed from that of the Greek and Latin editions previously made public. They were exhibited in the following order:—1 ad Smyrnenses, 2 ad Polycarpum, 3 ad Ephesios, 4 ad Magnesios, 5 ad Philadelphicos, 6 ad Trallesios, 7 Mariæ, proselytæ Chassaobolorum ad Ignatium, 8 Ignatii ad Mariam proselytam, 9 ad Tarsenses, 10 ad Antiochenos, 11 ad Eronem, 12 ad Romanos.

'Besides this difference in the arrangement of these epistles, the text itself was found to display considerable variations from the previous editions, to omit altogether many passages, and likewise to amplify and extend in the manner of a paraphrase numerous others.'—*Corpus Ignatianum*, Introd., vii. viii.

Mr. Cureton then speaks of the grounds which led Archbishop Usher to conclude,—

'That the recension contained in the manuscripts which he had discovered might be considered as a tolerably accurate representation of the text of the Ignatian Epistles in the fourth and fifth centuries, though not precisely corresponding with it in every particular.'

The Archbishop accordingly used his utmost endeavours to *restore* the text of the Epistles by means of the Latin version which he had thus brought to light. He followed Vedelius in rejecting the Epistles not mentioned by Eusebius; he also rejected the Epistle to Polycarp as differing in *style* from the six which he received; and for this he thought he had the authority of Jerome, who (in his opinion) identified the Epistle to Polycarp with that to the Smyrnæans. In this, however, the learned Primate was clearly in error; for the statement of Jerome wholly *depends* upon that of Eusebius from whom it is taken.

In 1644 Archbishop Usher published his recension of the Ignatian Epistles: he gave the Greek text and the Latin (with some corrections) which had been published by Faber Stapulensis. To these he subjoined the *other* and shorter Latin version which he had himself discovered. As an emendation of the Greek text the Archbishop printed in *red* whatever had nothing in the shorter Latin corresponding to it; and thus he led the way towards a purer text: he still thought, however, that there were many things

Digitized by Google

things even in the shorter Latin which could not have proceeded from the pen of Ignatius; and thus he doubted whether the Ignatian Epistles could be restored without a more correct Greek text, which he thought he might procure from Florence, or unless he obtained *a Syriac text* of these Epistles which he believed might be found at Rome.

The Medicean Greek text of these Epistles, to which Archbishop Usher had thus directed attention, was printed by ISAAC VOSSIUS in the year 1646. This MS. evidently gives the text which answers to the shorter Latin version brought to light by Archbishop Usher; it contains eight of the Epistles, and part of the ninth in the same order as in that version; had it not been defective at the end it would, no doubt, have also contained the rest. In the following year Archbishop Usher published his *Appendix Ignatiana*, giving the Medicean Greek text of the six Epistles which he considered to be genuine; this was accompanied with a Latin translation. The learned Archbishop complains in his preface that he had not found the Medicean text *very correct*, but that nothing further could be done but to wait till a more accurate copy should come to light. The Greek text of COTELERIUS (1672) was formed mostly on that of Vossius: the Epistle to the Romans, however, was corrected from the text as exhibited by Simeon Metaphrastes, and the shorter Usherian Latin text.

In 1689 the Greek text of the Epistle to the Romans was published by RUINART in the Acts of the Martyrdom of Ignatius from a Colbert MS.: this text belongs to the same recension as the Medicean MS., and supplies this part of what was there wanting. ITTIGIUS published together the *seven* shorter Greek Epistles, thus completing what has since that time been most commonly printed as the body of the writings of Ignatius.

No other Greek MS. has come to light which has furnished data on the subject; and thus, prior to the labours of Mr. Cureton, nothing further had been done in connection with the *text* of these Epistles, except the more accurate collation of the Medicean MS.; for this we are indebted to the present learned Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, Dr. JACOBSON, who undertook this labour for his edition of the Apostolical Fathers.

We do not enter in this place into the controversies which were carried on as to the genuineness of these Epistles; although the time when so much attention was directed to the correction of the text, was the very period in which the controversy was most warmly maintained. We have first to notice the discovery and labours of Mr. Cureton, which, by affecting all questions as to the

Digitized by Google

the *text* of the Epistles, also affects all the points in debate as to the genuineness.

Mr. Cureton's own account of the discovery of the Syriac version in his introduction is full of interest: and it is at least remarkable that after two centuries a text should be brought to light, of which Archbishop Usher had heard, and which he had *desired* to obtain.

Bishop FELL made attempts to procure a copy of such a Syriac version; to this end ROBERT HUNTINGDON (afterwards Bishop of Raphoe) used very great diligence during his residence in the East. It is remarkable that in his researches he journeyed to the very Nitrian monastery of Sta. Maria Deipara from which the MSS. of this version were of late procured. The MSS., however, were then not unfolded to the visitor's gaze.

RENAUDOT, in 1716, directed attention to the fact, that passages from the Ignatian Epistles are found in a collection of canons in Syriac. In 1725 the Syriac catalogue of Ebed Jesu was printed in Assemani's *Bibliotheca Orientalis.* In this the Syriac version is mentioned; and Assemani also stated that a Syriac copy of the Acts of the Martyrdom of Ignatius existed in the Vatican.

Mr. Cureton found in the British Museum, amongst the MSS. collected by Mr. Rich, an imperfect volume, containing, amongst other lives of saints and martyrs, a fragment of the Martyrdom of Ignatius, in which, as usual, was inserted his Epistle to the Romans. Of this, from the defective state of the MS., there was only the beginning. Mr. Cureton had transcribed this in 1839, and then he vainly endeavoured to procure from Rome a copy of the entire epistle in Syriac; but of this he says,—

'I was, however, sadly disappointed in this my expectation; for, although my application was made and repeated through a channel which I had every ground to suppose would prove successful, the only reply which I could obtain was, that no such book existed. It is, nevertheless, distinctly stated to be in the collection of Syriac MSS. in the Vatican, both by J. S. Assemani, and also by his cousin Step. Evod. Assemani.' (xxvi.)

New data were, however, about to be furnished to Mr. Cureton. The treasures of the Nitrian valley were about to enrich the British Museum; and thus the Syriac sources, for which former scholars had sought in vain, were to be opened to him.

Archdeacon Tattam's visit to Egypt in 1837 and 1838 was the means of procuring several ancient Syriac MSS. from the convent of Sta. Maria Deipara for the British Museum.

'No sooner' (says Mr. Cureton) 'was this collection deposited in the British Museum, than I anxiously examined the contents of every volume, to ascertain if any of the Epistles of Ignatius were among them;

Digitized by Google

them; and I was rejoiced to discover, not only several extracts from these Epistles, cited by different ecclesiastical writers, but also the entire Epistle to St. Polycarp, in a volume of great antiquity.'

But this was not enough to satisfy an *ardent* scholar like Mr. Cureton. There were good grounds for believing that the Nitrian monastery still possessed at least two hundred Syriac volumes, of an antiquity prior to the close of the ninth century.

'Encouraged by finding one Syriac Epistle of St. Ignatius to hope for the discovery of others, and extremely desirous of exploring the remainder of those volumes of such venerable antiquity, and of rescuing them from the obscurity in which they were lying, and from the destruction with which they were threatened, I naturally felt a most intense anxiety that some measures should be speedily taken to endeavour to obtain for the Library of the British Museum the rest of the MSS. belonging to the Nitrian convent. Archdeacon Tattam, equally zealous with myself in the same cause, voluntarily offered his services to undertake another voyage into Egypt, and to endeavour to negociate for the purchase of them. The present Duke of Northumberland most cordially approved and effectually aided our endeavours; and in the year 1842, the Trustees of the British Museum having applied for and obtained a special grant from the Lords of the Treasury for this purpose, Archdeacon Tattam shortly afterwards started upon his second expedition into Egypt in quest of MSS. This undertaking was crowned with very great success; and on the 1st of March, in the year 1843, between three and four hundred additional volumes, from the monastery of the valley of the Ascetics, arrived in the British Museum. I immediately began to examine their contents, and had the rare satisfaction of having my hopes realized by finding among them, not only several additional passages from St. Ignatius, quoted by various authors, but also *three entire Epistles*—to St. Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans—in a volume of very considerable antiquity.'—p. xxviii.

But this was not all: the monks of Sta. Maria Deipara, while they professed to dispose of all their Syriac books, retained several still; nearly half were withheld for some future occasion.

'In the year 1847, M. Auguste Pacho was fortunate enough to become the possessor of the remainder of the MSS. belonging to the Brethren of St. Mary Deipara; and the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury having most liberally purchased them from him to complete the collection already deposited in the British Museum, I had the happiness of discovering among them another copy of the Three Epistles of St. Ignatius, in one of those volumes which had been presented to the monastery in the year 931 by the Superior, Moses of Nisibis.'

The first use which Mr. Cureton made of his discovery was to publish, in 1845, 'The ancient Syriac version of the Epistles of St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans, . . . edited

Digitized by Google

edited with an English translation and notes'—a volume which interested many, ourselves not least—which raised new inquiries, and opened a field of investigation previously untrodden. If the discovery of the shorter Latin version by Archbishop Usher, and the publication of the Medicean Greek text by Vossius, was an important era in the history of the Ignatian Epistles, how much more the discovery and publication of the *Curetonian* Syriac text?

The edition of 1845 was soon out of print, and now Mr. Cureton has superseded it by the *Corpus Ignatianum* before us. It will be seen that he now has greater MS. authority for his text than he had in 1845.

A full description is given of the MSS. used for this work. The *first* of these contains the Epistle to Polycarp, written on the last leaf of the MS., which comprises other works. This MS. appears to be rightly considered by Mr. Cureton to belong to the first half of the sixth century. From this MS. Mr. Cureton has taken the *text* of the Epistle to Polycarp. The second MS. (procured by Archdeacon Tattam in 1842) appears to be 'certainly not later than the seventh or eighth century.' It contains the three Syriac Epistles, with other works before them and after them. Of the *third* MS. *two quires and two leaves* were procured by Dr. Tattam in 1843. The rest of the volume (in all thirty-one quires, each of ten leaves) was obtained by M. Pacho. This MS. contains, amongst many other works, the same three Epistles of Ignatius. It appears to belong to the sixth or seventh century.

Besides the description of the MSS., we are also furnished with a fac-simile of each, executed with great skill and elegance. Mr. Cureton shall be allowed to express in his own words to whom he is under obligation for them:—

'I should be ungrateful to pass without acknowledgment the help of *my wife*, in executing for me the fac-simile of the manuscripts upon the authority of which the Syriac text of the Epistles of Ignatius is based.'—*Pref.*, p. xvii.

Every scholar who uses the volume will be ready to acknowledge his obligation to *Mrs. Cureton.*

We have already alluded to the discussions on the subject of the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles. Doubts were expressed, before many years after their first publication had elapsed, as to the whole collection which bore the name of this ancient martyr of Christ; and while some asserted the whole to be his unadulterated writings, others thought them to be 'a barefaced and stupid forgery.' Mr. Cureton thus states the general judgment of scholars on the subject:—

'The opinion, however, which seems most generally to have prevailed

Digitized by Google

vailed among moderate and reflecting persons was, that Ignatius did indeed write epistles; but that those which then bore his name had been much corrupted and interpolated by later hands.'

Marks of interpolation may be so strong, that no evidence that a book, under such a title, was written by the person whose name it bears, will convince the reader that the document which professes to be the ancient book is really such, or that it can now be in the same state and condition as when it left the hands of the author.

After the edition of Vedelius, the controversies assumed a more definite form than had been the case before. The attempt which he made to discriminate with regard to *what* Epistles, bearing the name of Ignatius, were genuine and *what* were spurious, presented more tangible points, both for attack and defence, than when the whole of the Epistles were placed on the same indefinite and uncertain ground. Claude de Saumaise, under the name of *Walo Messalinus* (1641), Blondel (1646), Aubertin (1655), and others, attacked the whole collection as the production of a later age than that of Ignatius. It must be owned that there were very suspicious circumstances connected with these writings; for (to say nothing at present of the three forged Epistles extant in Latin only) the defenders of the seven Ignatian Epistles had to admit, in general, that these seven came to us in suspicious company, since five confessedly spurious Epistles, both in Latin and Greek, were transmitted in the same collection, and with no note of suspicion. This was enough to suggest caution, and to lead to some doubt as to the genuineness of all that had been thus transmitted. In the longer Epistles, which alone were then known, there are passages which *must* be posterior to the time of Ignatius. *Persons* are mentioned (*e. g.* Theodotus) who lived long after his days. Such Epistles therefore could only be defended by admitting interpolation.

The difficulties connected with this subject were not removed by the labours of Usher and Vossius. The sphere of inquiry was enlarged, and it was evident to all defenders that busy hands had meddled with these Epistles, either in the way of addition or of omission.

Daille', in 1666, published his attack on the genuineness of these Epistles. His work has been long considered far more able than those of his predecessors. In one point, however, he and they are all agreed, namely, that the Epistles bearing the name of Ignatius were not his, but forged at a later date. *When* this might have taken place, various opinions were expressed, but the general point for which they contended was the same.

The work of Daillé called forth, on behalf of seven Epistles in their

Digitized by Google

their shorter form, PEARSON'S *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii* (1672), a work as superior to those which had preceded on the side of the defenders as that of Daillé had been to the previous assaults. Pearson (soon afterwards Bishop of Chester) published his *Vindiciæ* after the death of Daillé, and to this a reply was made by LARROQUE (anonymously) in 1674.

The especial points urged by the assailants were—the entirely different mould of thought in which the Epistles were cast from that of the Christians in the first and second centuries; the passages in the Epistles which appear to allude to heresies, &c., which did not exist till after the time of Ignatius; and, in particular, the tone in which these Epistles assert the authority of an Episcopal order as wholly distinct from and superior to Presbyters.

The Epistles were defended by showing, from ancient testimony, that Ignatius did actually write Epistles;—by endeavouring to identify the shorter Epistles of the Medicean text with those which proceeded from his pen;—by the attempt to avoid the force of the argument drawn from the alleged reference to heresies and opinions which afterwards prevailed, by seeking to show either that the supposed allusions were not really such, or that the false doctrines did actually exist in the time of Ignatius,—and by accepting the hierarchical dogmas found in these Epistles as such as might reasonably belong to the beginning of the second century.

Some of the objections had been made against the longer, and others against the Medicean text;[c] others were common to both. The Medicean text of seven Epistles was taken as the defensible ground, although the defenders of its *general* genuineness fairly admitted that it was by no means free from errors and obscure passages.

The Epistles of Ignatius received much of this attention from the bearing which they were supposed to possess on the questions at issue between Episcopalians and those who asserted the identity of Bishops and Presbyters. This really gave its point to the controversy. Bishop Pearson commences his Procemium in these words:

'Celebris est, hoc præsertim sæculo, de ordinis Episcopalis à Presbyratu distinctione, vel saltem distinctionis origine Controversia. In eâ autem tractandâ magni ponderis meritò habita est S. Ignatii, viri Apostolici et Martyris autoritas; cujus disertissimo locupletissimoque testimonio cùm Episcopalis causa fulciatur, et paritatis Presbyterane

[c] For convenience we use the term *Medicean* text as denoting that Greek text which accords with Archbishop Usher's Latin, though the Florentine document is imperfect. To use the 'shorter text' might seem to imply that there has been some independent diplomatic transmission of seven such Epistles, when the contrary is notoriously the fact. The Medicean text may be used as a general term, just as the Roman Catholic translation is called the *Douay* Bible, although the New Testament had been previously published at *Rheims*.

antiquitas

Digitized by Google

antiquitas nuper excogitata concidat, eo tandem deventum est; ut qui aliter sententiam Episcopatui iniquiorem tueri nullo modo possent, omnes Ignatii epistolas convellerent, à S. Martyre scriptas negarent, fictas et supposititicias pronunciarent.'

This was really the principal point at issue. Pearson's mind was strongly made up on the subject; and with this feeling predominant, he wrote his reply to Daillé. Now while we quite admit that questions of what an author did or did not write, should be considered irrespective of any one's personal thoughts on Church polity or doctrine, yet there may be such a presentation of particular sentiments couched in strong language, as to make one feel that if this be not the tone of expression common at the time when the author is said to have lived, the *repeated* occurrence of such statements, casts some suspicion on the authenticity of the document.

It appears to us, after a reconsideration of the subject, just as it did many years ago, that Pearson assumed a conclusion, and then sought by ingenuity of argument to invalidate all that could be brought to bear against that conclusion. He proves that Ignatius did write some Epistles; he seeks to prove that all the seven mentioned by Eusebius must have been equally certainly the productions of Ignatius,—that they were transmitted, *on the whole*, in an uncorrupted condition,—and that *perhaps* the objections which Daillé had so skilfully and so learnedly brought forward, were not so forcible as he had alleged; and that they do not *of necessity* demonstrate that the Medicean text *cannot* be the genuine Epistles of the Bishop of Antioch.

But some of Daillé's arguments are very forcible: the allusion in the Medicean text to the Valentinian σιγὴ seems to us to be too plain and certain to be doubted;[d] and the *accumulation* of hierarchical passages *cannot*, we think, belong to the real Ignatius. The reply of Larroque to Pearson was thought as full and complete by many as the subject required.

The controversy might be said to have rested at this point; for Dr. Wake (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), when he published his translation of the Apostolic Fathers in 1695, could hardly be said to have taken up the questions: he *reasserted* certain statements, and advocated the genuineness of these Epistles in

[d] In the Epistle to the Magnesians (chap. viii.) the words occur, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ λόγος ἀΐδιος, οὐκ ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών, 'who is his eternal Word, not having come forth from SILENCE.' If this do not refer to the Valentinian *Sigè*, *Silence*, it would be hard to conceive *why* such a statement could have been made: indeed it is *strange* that any one could have thought it meant anything else: but that the Valentinian system and nomenclature existed in the days of Ignatius cannot be *shown*, whatever be *asserted* on the subject. Had there been any *reasonable* ground for supposing Valentinianism so early, no other solution would ever have been imagined.

Digitized by Google

such a way as to add nothing to the advance made by others.* WHISTON afterwards maintained the genuineness of the longer epistles and the whole twelve; this, however, was on doctrinal grounds: he considered them more favourable (or, at least, less opposed) to his Arian sentiments than the Medicean recension. Some of his remarks on the smaller Epistles in the places in which they differ from the larger, are acute, and such as a defender of the Medicean recension would find difficulty in meeting fully.

It has often been said that Bishop's Pearson's *Vindiciæ* have been *generally* considered to have set the question at rest; this however is far from accurate. Most may have felt that the subject was encompassed with difficulties; few however doubted that Ignatius wrote some Epistles; but very few *who had read the Epistles*, believed that we now have them as they came from the pen of that ancient martyr. The hierarchic passages occasioned not a little of this difficulty.

The following are specimens:—

'It is evident that we ought to look unto the bishop as the Lord himself.'—Eph. vi.

'Inasmuch as ye are subject to the bishop as to Jesus Christ, ye appear to me not to live after the manner of men, but according to Jesus Christ,' &c.—Trall. ii.

'Let all reverence the deacons as Jesus Christ; and the bishop as the Father; and the presbyters as the sanhedrim of God and college of the Apostles.[f] WITHOUT THESE THERE IS NO CHURCH.'—Trall. iii.

'The bishop presiding in the place of God, and the Presbyters in the place of the sanhedrim of the Apostles, and the deacons, most dear to me, being intrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ,' &c.—Magn. vi.

'All of you follow the bishop, as Jesus Christ the Father: and the presbytery, as the Apostles: honour the deacons as the commandment of God. . . . Let that Eucharist be considered valid which is celebrated by the bishop, or by him whom he has permitted. . . . It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to celebrate an Agapè.' —Smyrn. viii.

'Although some wished to deceive me according to the flesh, yet the Spirit is not deceived seeing it is from God: for it knoweth whence it

---

* Archbishop Wake's translation makes one sometimes doubt if he *understood* what he had before him: thus in Ephesians chap. xx. he translates ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ βιβλιδίῳ ὃ μέλλω γράφειν ὑμῖν, 'in a second epistle which I will SUDDENLY write unto you.'

[f] Is this the manner in which a Christian teacher at the close of the Apostolic age would DEGRADE the Apostles? God set in His Church *first Apostles*; but *here* they seem reduced to mere Presbyters; and Bishops (of whom Ignatius himself was one) are set over them and compared to God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. It is hard to suppose that any can defend these statements as if they could have been made by one in that age, unless he were a Marcion, an *opposer* of Apostolic authority.

cometh

Digitized by Google

cometh and whither it goeth, and it reproveth secret things. I cried when I was amongst you, I spake with a loud voice:—Attend to the bishop, and to the presbytery, and to the deacons. And some supposed that I said these things as knowing before the division of some: but He in whom I am in bonds is witness that I knew it not from men. BUT THE SPIRIT PROCLAIMED, saying thus,—*Do nothing without the Bishop.*' —Philad. vii.

These are but a few instances of the hierarchic tone which *pervades* the Ignatian epistles in Greek and Latin: we should have thought the most strenuous supporter of Episcopacy would have considered the statements far too strong, and that the distorted and exaggerated view of the subject was such as did not commend the Episcopal system of Church government. And besides this, we do not find any similar *tone* of assertion in the earliest writers. Ignatius is made to speak the language of later ages. Perhaps the assertions on the subject have been so strongly put, as in fact to accord with no system of Church government which ever existed. A *hierarchy* is exalted to the skies; but language seems to fail when the BISHOP'S authority is mentioned.

There are many other things in the common texts of the Ignatian Epistles which seem just as incongruous,—just as little in accordance with the train of thought in the New Testament, or with the character of the instruction of other 'Apostolical Fathers,' such as Clemens Romanus and Polycarp.

We are not surprised (nor do we think that considerate scholars will be) at the statement of Mr. Cureton,—

'I do not hesitate to avow, that although I have often read the seven letters attributed to St. Ignatius in the Greek, as they were first published together by Dr. Smith in the year 1709, I never could persuade myself that *all* which they contained were the genuine thoughts and expressions of that Holy Martyr.'[s]

As to ourselves, after the best examination which we were able to give the subject, we mostly acquiesced in the opinions of Archbishop Usher and Mosheim.

'De Græcis quæ circumferuntur Ignatii Epistolis hodie si quæratur; omninò respondendum esse concludimus, earum sex *nothas*, totidem alias *mixtas*, nullas omni ex parte sinceras esse habendas et *genuinas*.'

'The whole question relating to the Epistles of St. Ignatius in general, seems to me to labour under much obscurity, and to be embarrassed with many difficulties.'

[s] Vindiciæ Ignatianæ, p. 4. Mr. Cureton continues:—'Every investigation that I was able to make tended to strengthen this belief; while, on the other hand, I felt an anxious desire to be convinced of their genuineness, because I believed them to be in every way consistent with orthodox doctrine, and to supply arguments which, if their authority were unquestionably established, would be very forcible to some minds with respect to that system of Church government and discipline, to which I am by duty and feeling so closely attached.'

Digitized by Google

In examining the two recensions, many considerations led us to think that *both* were interpolated; this opinion especially arose from the fact that *each* recension contains sentences or whole chapters (as at the end of the Ephesians) entirely differing from what is found in the other, and also from the prominence given in the shorter to important doctrinal truth, which is so introduced, that it seems like something almost extraneous to the texture of the letters, and which is not found in the longer interpolated recension.

We thus assented to Griesbach's judgment, so that we *habitually* spoke of twofold interpolation as our opinion on the subject:—

'Forsitan etiam duplex illa Ignatiarum Epistolarum recensio invenustis hujusmodi studiis suam debet originem. *Quid? si utraque, quæ nobis superest, recensio dicatur paraphrasis esse Epistolarum Ignatii genuinarum*, plane deperditarum? Non desunt enim in utraque interpolationum et immutationum vestigia. A diversis Christianorum sectis, quarum altera tamen multò audacior fuit altera, concinnatæ videntur diversæ editiones.'—Opusc. Acad. i. 26.

We had left the subject of the Ignatian Epistles for ten years as one thus involved in uncertainty, when a new light dawned upon it. In 1845, Mr. Cureton published the Syriac version of the three Epistles which he had discovered.[h] Here then it seemed as though the *wish* of Usher was gratified, and the sagacious inquiry of Griesbach was borne out by the fact. Here was a text of three of the Ignatian Epistles in no way obnoxious to the objections which Daillé and others had brought against the texts which they knew. Could it have been thought that any prophetic sagacity on the part of a Syriac translator had led him to omit the passages to which objections were made in after ages? or must we conclude that the questionable passages were after-insertions?

The three most remarkable features of the Curetonian text of the three Epistles are its shortness, when compared either with the Medicean or the longer recension,—the non-insertion of the very many passages which speak of the hierarchy in the exalted terms to which we have alluded;[i] and the absence of some of the reiterated passages in which doctrinal statements on the subject

[h] Mr. Cureton's volume was placed in our hands, soon after it appeared, by that eminent scholar the Chevalier Bunsen. The Ignatian Epistles happened to be mentioned, when, to our surprise and interest, he showed us the newly-found text devoid of the passages to which such objections had been made.

[i] It is probably well that the Syrian recension was brought to light by a clergyman of the Church of England, and that he published it under the patronage of the (late) Archbishop of Canterbury. These facts were a good security against all *mala fides* as to the contents. Judging from the opposition which has been made, we may conclude that if any Presbyterian or Lutheran (to say nothing now of Dissenters) had published this text, the very sources from which it has been drawn would be questioned. Which will men prefer, TRUTH or *prejudice*?

of

Digitized by Google

of the person of our Lord Jesus Christ are made, after the manner of a confession of faith.

The Epistle to Polycarp differs less on the whole in the Syriac version from the Greek texts than either of the other two: and this Epistle was pointed out by Vedelius more than two centuries ago as differing remarkably in style from the others; this judgment was so fully acquiesced in, that Archbishop Usher rejected it as spurious, and Mosheim regarded it as doubtful.

In the Syriac text of the Epistle to the Romans, there are two chapters found which commonly are read as the vth and vith of that to the Trallians. It is remarkable that the difference between these chapters and the rest of that Epistle was noticed by Vedelius: sagacity has rarely met with such a confirmation. In the Epistle to the Romans they are found in a suitable place; not so in that to the Trallians. The decided marks of originality possessed by the Epistle to the Romans in that part, where but little has been added to what is read in the Syriac, have been noticed by many; and this observed feature is remarkably confirmed.

We were particularly struck in seeing how, in such passages as the 20th chapter to the Ephesians, where the longer and Medicean texts differ altogether, the Syriac is wholly silent. This appeared to us a strong proof of our previously formed judgment, that both Greek recensions were enlargements and alterations of some common original.

On doctrinal subjects we could not perceive that the Syriac text had *omitted* passages to uphold any particular system; while a comparison of its text with the longer and the Medicean, seemed to indicate that the one had been interpolated with an Arian, the other with an orthodox bias.

But no non-insertions were so *remarkable* as those relating to the hierarchy: of those passages which, in the Epistles as commonly read, present such *exaggerated* thoughts, *not one* was found in the Syriac. Could they then have been omitted by an anti-Episcopalian translator? But what Syrian Church or body of Christians were anti-Episcopal in their practice? And, indeed, while the overdrawn statements are not found, it is certain that it can have been from no objection to the form of Church government which, we know, *did* so early exist.

'Regard the bishop, that God also may regard you. May my soul be with those who are subject to the bishop, the presbyters, the deacons, with whom be my portion from God.'—Polyc. vi.

This passage is proof decisive that no objection to Episcopalian statements led to the rejection of the strong hierarchic passages. This passage proves the *fact* of the Episcopacy of Ignatius's days. How

Digitized by Google

How it arose, what its authority, and other particulars respecting it we have not to discuss: we have only to accept the fact that the term ἐπίσκοπος was then used in an appropriated sense, and that he was then distinguished from the πρεσβύτεροι.

It was only natural that some discussions should arise from the publication of the Syriac Epistles. Of these we will speak before resuming the question of the comparative claims of the three recensions.

There is a tendency in men's minds to adhere to what is received, even though such reception may have commenced without examination: this tendency alone would explain why some should feel alarm at the publication of an Ignatian text so much shorter than had been previously known.[k]

A few months after Mr. Cureton's volume appeared, an attack was made in the *English Review* (No. VIII., Dec., 1845). In this assault the opinion was advanced that the Syriac text was an heretical epitome made in support of Eutychian doctrine. The line of supposed proof was, that the Syriac text omits many strong anti-Eutychian statements. But even if this had been more manifest than it is, it would have proved nothing. We know that if a person be accustomed to a passage in any writer which contradicts any erroneous doctrine, and if he finds a copy of the work *without* the passage, he may easily think that it has been withdrawn by those who uphold the heterodox opinion. Thus some formerly *dreamed* that 1 John v. 7 had been expunged by the Arians. Let any one whose *ear* is accustomed to the Nicene creed, as we now have it,[m] meet with a copy running thus: 'And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified,'—would he not (if ignorant of the *history* of the Creed) be likely to say, Surely the omission of the words '*and the Son*' (after '*proceedeth from the Father*') argues that some one has struck out the words to uphold the Greek dogma concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost? And if he met with another copy in which *all* that relates to the Holy Ghost was *omitted*, would he not suspect that some *Pneumatomachian* hand had daringly erased that part of the orthodox confession?

And yet how crude and groundless would such surmises be! The *Nicene* form was the *shorter*; for then the proper Godhead

[k] In Bishop Monk's Life of Bentley, i. p. 131, he mentions one of the publications called forth by the controversy relative to the Epistles of Phalaris. He says:—'To give a specimen of this author's ratiocination; he contends that injury is done to literature by proving books not to proceed from the great men to whom they are attributed, since the value of the work is frequently estimated by the name it bears: *an argument which tells in an exactly opposite direction to that which he designed.*'

[m] *i. e.* the *Constantinopolito*-Nicene, with one added clause.

Digitized by Google of

of Christ was the matter in question: the Constantinopolitan addition introduced the confession concerning the Holy Ghost; and the further statement of His procession *from the Son* was introduced in after ages. This may illustrate the groundlessness of the mode of proof urged by the English Reviewer in his attack.

A charge of heretical pravity is serious. Mr. Cureton had not intended to defend his work; but when the charge of heresy was raised, he felt that in justice to himself and to the late Archbishop of Canterbury, to whom his work had been dedicated, it was needful to reply. What a consideration! to be charged with publishing heretical extracts, without knowing that they were heretical.

Mr. Cureton's *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*[n] accordingly appeared. We have carefully read the review to which he replied, and compared it with this reply; and we consider that Mr. Cureton has demonstrated the groundlessness of the charge: others have thought the same. It will be sufficient to mention Dr. JACOBSON, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Professor DENZINGER, of Würtzburg, both defenders of the Medicean text as to seven Epistles, and both deniers of the charge of heretical pravity brought against the Syriac version.

Other objections made in the *English Review* were equally untenable. Those based on the better connection of passages in the Medicean text were uncertain, even as to that fact; and an apparently better or worse connection *proves* nothing in such a case. A spurious insertion will not become good and genuine, because it appears to connect itself well with the passage into which it is introduced.

One specific objection was raised against the *close* of the Epistles in the Syriac. It was thought that benedictions and salutations (as contained in the Greek) ought to be found at least in that part. Mr. Cureton, in reply, pointed to the Epistle of St. James, which ends with even more concise abruptness, and to the First Epistle of St. John: he also showed the custom of the time of Ignatius from Pliny's Letters to Trajan.[o]

[n] Vindiciæ Ignatianæ; or the Genuine Writings of St. Ignatius, as exhibited in the Antient Syriac Version, vindicated from the Charge of Heresy. By the Rev. William Cureton, M.A., F.R.S., of the British Museum; late sub-Librarian of the Bodleian Library: '*Quanto beatissimi martyris Ignatii, qui cum Christi Apostolis familiariter versatus est, et antiquitas et authoritas major; eo ecclesiæ magis interest videre, ne quo pacto apocrypha illi attributa cum authenticis ipsius scriptis commisceantur et confundantur.*' (Archbishop Usher.) London: Rivingtons, M,DCCC,XLVI.

[o] A late reviewer objects to Mr. Cureton's illustration of the close of the Syrian Epistle to the Ephesians by thus comparing it with those of Pliny: he says that this is not 'at all happy'! Perhaps he wished to *add* something to complete the Letters of Pliny; but then would not the Epistle of James and 1 John need similar supplements?

The

Digitized by Google

The Chevalier BUNSEN introduced the Curetonian text to the attention of foreign scholars. The importance of possessing some *certain* writings of Ignatius has been shown by the sensitiveness exhibited by the *destructives* of Tübingen. If we possess something genuine, really written by that ancient martyr, in which evident allusions to the New Testament are found, then the wild theories of that school, which would deny the existence of our Scriptures till a later period, must certainly fall. BAUR[P] has opposed the Chevalier Bunsen on this subject. He *asserts* that we must give up *the whole* of seven Ignatian Epistles, or else receive *the whole*. He says that all *must*, from the conformity of style, &c., have proceeded from the *same hand*. And yet long ages before the Curetonian text was discovered, differences of style had been pointed out, in conformity with what we find as genuine in the Syriac! So much for Baur's dogmatic *assertions*.

After the edition of these Epistles, published in 1845, was exhausted, Mr. Cureton prepared the volume before us, *Corpus Ignatianum*. He gives, in his Preface, some account of the manner in which the Medicean text had been defended by Dr. JACOBSON and Dr. HEFELE, in their respective editions of the Apostolic Fathers. They uphold the text which Bishop Pearson vindicated: they consider the Syriac to be a compendium made for pious use: they do *not*, however, meet the grave objections which many minds felt with regard to the Medicean recension, while Dr. Jacobson candidly allows that it is not very pure.

The publication of the *Corpus Ignatianum* has called forth new discussions. Some have hailed the diligent and successful labour of Mr. Cureton,—they have rejoiced to see something demonstrably tangible presented to their attention: others, who regret the loss of so much that has passed under the name of Ignatius, have *insinuated doubts* and *hinted distrust* of Mr. Cureton. Nor have open attacks been wanted: whether these have possessed weight of *argument* or not, we might safely leave to the judgment of others.

The *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal* has especially attacked Mr. Cureton and his conclusions. The journalist takes the ground that Bishop Pearson '*triumphantly* answered' the exceptions to the Ignatian epistles; and in opposing Mr. Cureton he rests on Dr. Hefele, Dr. Jacobson, or the English Reviewer, *ad libitum*. Throughout there is, however, the radical mistake of assuming the very point at issue. In an inquiry into the genuineness of writings, we ought to go on grounds of evidence, so as to establish

[P] Die Ignatianischen Briefe und Ihr neuester Kritiker. Eine Streitschrift gegen Herrn Bunsen. Von Dr. F. Ch. BAUR, Professor der Theologie in Tübingen. 1848.

positively

Digitized by Google

positively what we want to prove to be genuine; it is not sufficient to show that exceptions against such genuineness are not conclusive *per se*.

The concluding observations of the writer in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal* call for some remark. He says,—

'We do not think that the able and accomplished writer in the *English Review* has said anything which could call for warmth on Mr. Cureton's part, when he conjectured that the Syrian translator might have been a Eutychian heretic; this surely was no disparagement of *Mr. Cureton's* labours.'

Does the reviewer really mean that to charge on a book so grave an accusation as *Eutychian heresy*, may not well call forth *warmth* on the part of him who repels the reproach? Such accusations ought not to be brought except on the most certain and unquestionable grounds. Does the reviewer consider the doctrinal error of the Eutychians to be *slight*? or does he think 'heretic' and 'heresy' are *gentle* terms? Surely if, when he wrote this passage, he had considered *what* such a charge involved, he would have expressed himself very differently.

The writer in the English Review did not merely express a conjecture, but he made a distinct charge. He says, '*This Syriac version* PROVES *to be a miserable epitome made by an Eutychian heretic;*' and this was accompanied by remarks which do most thoroughly disparage Mr. Cureton's labours. He is represented as spending his time and thoughts over a work which is after all only a miserable and heretical epitome, and that too without being conscious that any heretical pravity was there lurking. *If* Mr. Cureton's reply does display warmth,[q] it is not surprising, whatever the Irish reviewer may think, that he should have indignantly repelled so tremendous a charge; but if, on the other hand, Mr. Cureton has answered the accusation with calmness and cool decision, it shows with what equanimity he was able to write, even on such a subject, conscious of the goodness of his cause.

[q] 'I will here crave the reader's leave to make one general apology for anything either in my Dissertation or my Defence of it, that may seem too severe. I desire but this favour, or justice rather, that he would suppose my case to be his own: and then, if he will say sincerely, that he should have answered so many calumnies with fewer marks of resentment, I am content to lie under his censure. But it's a very difficult thing, for a person unconcerned and out of the reach of harm, to be a fair arbitrator here. He will be apt to think the injured party too angry; because he cannot have as great a passion in seeing the ill usage, as the other has in feeling it. . . . . 'Twas an excellent saying of Solon's and worthy of the wisest of the famous Seven, who, when he was asked, *What would rid the world of injuries? If the bystanders*, says he, *would have the same resentment with those that suffer the wrong.* If the reader will but follow that great man's advice, and have an equal sense of my ill usage as if it had fallen upon himelf, I dare then challenge him to think, if he can, that I have used too much severity.'—BENTLEY, *Preface to Dissertation upon Phalaris:* (Dyce's edition, p. xlviii.)

It

Digitized by Google

It is needless to remark on the charge. The Eutychianism is not to be found in the Syriac Epistles themselves. Dr. Jacobson has rightly condemned this conjectural charge as being an unhappy failure. We doubt whether the writer in the English Review would repeat it, now that its groundlessness has been shown.

To affix the brand-mark of *heresy* may perhaps be found effectual when a cause cannot be sustained by *argument*, but it is at least surprising that such a stigma can be spoken of in such a manner by the Irish reviewer. All orthodox Christianity has ever reprobated the Eutychian doctrines in the strongest terms, and yet we are told that such accusations are nothing that can call for warmth!

The reviewer then continues his remarks:—

'Nor, again, do we think that Mr. Cureton has shown sufficient grounds for stating that "it is quite obvious that Dr. Hefele's knowledge on the Ignatian question is too imperfect to allow his voice to have much weight upon this subject." '

As the reviewer has used Dr. Hefele's statements and remarks as those of which he approves, he is naturally unwilling that any doubt should be cast on the acquaintance with the subject which he may possess.

Of course we do not know what grounds the reviewer would think sufficient, but we believe that most will be satisfied with Mr. Cureton's statement, and that for this simple reason, that either Dr. Hefele's acquaintance with the subject is imperfect, or else he (wittingly and knowingly) asserted that *a man wrote a book after he was dead.*[r]

The whole argument has been placed before the reviewer. He sees 'no sufficient grounds' for doubting Dr. Hefele's knowledge of the subject: that is to say, with the error fully pointed out by Mr. Cureton, he can see no incongruity *in a man answering a book published two years after his death.*

The acts of British and Irish saints are indeed fertile in miracles; but this *post mortem* authorship is at least as wonderful as any that

[r] The passage in Mr. Cureton's preface stands thus:—'It is quite obvious that Dr. Hefele's knowledge on the Ignatian question is too imperfect to allow his voice to have much weight upon this subject. In his first edition of the works of the Apostolic Fathers, which was published in 1839, he has stated that Daillé made an attack upon Bishop Pearson's celebrated *Vindiciæ*, while the truth of the case is exactly the contrary. Bishop Pearson made the attack in his *Vindiciæ*, which was not published till six years after Daillé's work had appeared; the one bearing the date of 1666, and the other of 1672. Moreover Daillé had in the meanwhile paid the last debt to nature, having expired on the 15th of April, 1670. This extraordinary blunder, which no one acquainted with the two most learned and famous works that had appeared during the Ignatian controversy could have made, has been successively repeated in each of the subsequent editions of Hefele's work. In the third, now before me, he gives further proof of his ignorance of the contents of Bishop Pearson's celebrated *Vindiciæ*,' &c., p. vi.

have

Digitized by Google

have been recorded of those ancient worthies. The stupendous character of these miracles has been shrewdly attributed to the remarkable *simplicity* of those who have written the lives of the saints: perhaps this miracle is of the same class. Would it be too much if we hazard a conjecture that the Review itself may have proceeded from the pen of one of those long defunct chroniclers who recorded the acts of saints with such remarkable *simplicity*? Even if this conjecture be unfounded, there is nothing in the supposition which shows 'sufficient grounds' for doubting our acquaintance with the probabilities of the case.

The facts stand thus:—Dr. Hefele mentioned Daillé as one who had answered, or attempted to answer, Bishop Pearson's *Vindiciæ*. All who are really acquainted with the subject know full well that Daillé and Pearson wrote two of the most important works on the question; but Mr. Cureton pointed out that Dr. Hefele had *proved* himself to be unacquainted with even the outline of facts, for Daillé *died* in 1670, and Bishop Pearson published his *Vindiciæ* in 1672. Mr. Cureton does not seem to have thought it *probable* that Daillé could have written a book *two years after his death*. He little thought that the Irish reviewer would have said that he was of a *different* opinion.[a] It now seems that Mr. Cureton came to his conclusion too hastily when he boldly asserted that a man's death concluded all his authorship. However, we may learn by experience, and we shall find that it is not safe to affirm, that any opinion, however wonderful, is such that no one would state it and defend it. Dr. Hefele, we doubt not, knows many learned philosophers who would profoundly demonstrate that they themselves have no personal existence. We recommend this consideration to the Hibernian reviewer, for it is about as strange for *nonentities* to argue as for dead men to write books.

We leave it to others to judge whether the reviewer had 'sufficient grounds' for dissenting from Mr. Cureton's opinion, and whether we have 'sufficient grounds' for considering the reviewer to be himself very imperfectly acquainted with the facts and common sense of the question.[b]

This

[a] 'To give him his just commendation, he has taken the right way to put an end to any dispute; for a man that talks at that rate resolves not to be confuted. If I say that grass is green, or snow's white, I am still at the courtesy of my antagonist; for if he should rub his forehead and deny it, I do not see by what syllogism I could refute him.'—*Bentley* (Dyce's edition, ii. 14).

[b] It may be satisfactory to the Irish Ecclesiastical Reviewer to know that he has at the present moment *another* opportunity of applying his newly-discovered canons of criticism—and this, too, by a singular coincidence, in connection with *Bishop Pearson*.

The facts stand thus: an attack has been made on Bishop Pearson's ORTHODOXY (!!!). The impugner says, 'I do not know what authority Bishop Pearson's

Digitized by Google

This Irish journalist has known full well how to *mystify* the subject. He says, in speaking of the contents of the Medicean MS., 'the Epistle to Polycarp, which Usher had rejected, was contained in the Medicean MS., while that to the Romans, now received by Mr. Cureton, was wanting—so great are the difficulties which beset this question.' If the reviewer finds *difficulties* here, we know not where he will avoid them. The Medicean MS. is *defective at the end;* and as the Epistle to the Romans occupies the last place in the collection, of course it is here wanting. What

---

son's name ought to stamp upon any statement not clearly sustained by Scripture; but certainly, whatever may be pleaded on his authority, his orthodoxy, as a writer, has been *questioned* by one of his own Church in these words.' Then certain quotations are given—amongst the rest the following sentences:—'Some few of our own Church have gone to the same side with the older *Socinian* writers, in denying the Divine prescience of free, undetermined actions. In which number I must place a very candid and dispassionate inquirer, DR. PEARSON, who has lately preceded me in the office of this Lecture.'—'Many of his positions concerning the Divine foreknowledge are hazardous in the extreme, and some of them are more than hazardous.' We were astonished to hear that Bishop Pearson had been charged with heterodoxy. We examined these quotations with inquiring eyes. We saw that they were taken from *Davison's Warburton Lectures.* The '*office of this Lecture*' must then mean the Lecture founded by Bishop Warburton, and in this Dr. Pearson must have 'lately preceded' Davison.

This looks *strange:* Bishop Pearson died in 1686; Bishop Warburton, who founded the Lecture, was born in 1698: he lived till about fourscore, and founded the lectures which bear his name by his will. It is indeed remarkable, then, that Bishop Pearson *could* have preached Warburton Lectures *so long* after he was dead. Davison says, in 1825, that Dr. Pearson *lately* preceded him. How conveniently the new idea that there is nothing strange in men writing books after they are dead, comes to our assistance. *We* should have thought that this impugner of Bishop Pearson's orthodoxy was ignorant of the subject, and had ignorantly quoted from Davison's Lectures; and *we* should have suggested that he had actually confounded Dr. JOHN Pearson, Bishop of Chester (ob. 1686), with Dr. EDWARD Pearson, Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge (ob. 1811), a *real* Warburton lecturer *while alive,* to whom *we* thought that Davison referred,—were it not that we might be told that we had not shown *sufficient grounds* for our opinion. We therefore leave this deep and intricate question, only remarking that we have heard of Pope Julius II. being confounded with Julius Cæsar, and we have *known* Bonar's 'Night of Weeping' and other works attributed to Bishop Boner, the burner of the Protestants.

But to charge Bishop Pearson with '*Socinian views*' on any subject! The impugner, however, goes on to cite, from the *real* Bishop Pearson, what he says has in it 'the foundation of *Arianism*'! We are really glad, if Bishop Pearson's *orthodoxy* be attacked, to have the opportunity of repelling such insinuations against such a man, and thus to bear our humble testimony to him, even when engaged in showing that his *Vindiciæ* are inconclusive.

The impugner cites some scattered parts of an argument (as fragments); but *they* do not give Bishop Pearson's meaning; the omitted words are essential to the understanding of what he says with regard to our Lord,—'*In Him is the same fulness of the Godhead,* AND MORE THAN THAT THE FATHER CANNOT HAVE.' The impugner does not call Bishop Pearson an Arian; but he says that 'no one who understands what Arianism is,' can doubt that in the statements of Bishop Pearson 'he has the foundation of Arianism.' What then is orthodox belief? Would this impugner wish him to have said that the Son has *greater* fulness of the Godhead than the Father? If *such* means be used, how easy it is to charge any one with *heresy!* A charge, in our opinion, so solemn as to justify *warmth* in repelling it.

would

Digitized by Google

would be said of any critic who thought that the old part of the Vatican MS., not containing the Apocalypse, was 'a difficulty?' The reviewer might have known, from Mr. Cureton's pages, the true condition of the Florentine MS. of Ignatius.

Perhaps the reviewer's acquaintance with the subject is illustrated by the assertion, that since Bishop Pearson's time, 'the seven Epistles mentioned by Eusebius have been accepted as genuine.' How far from *general* this acceptance has been, Mr. Cureton's *Vindiciæ* (from which he quotes) might havn shown him.

We are inclined to make one suggestion to this Irish journalist. As he thinks that to affirm a man to have written a book after he was dead does not display an imperfect acquaintance with the subject, it might solve many difficulties if we extend this power of authorship to *Ignatius himself*. Hence we might conclude that *all* the Epistles which bear the name of Ignatius proceeded from his pen; that the refutations of heresies which commenced after his death were written by himself as occasion required; and that every extant form of the Epistles proceeded from his own hand. Why should not Ignatius be allowed to *add* to his Epistles from time to time? Are not these considerations worth the attention of the Irish reviewer?

Dr. PETERMANN, of Berlin, has recently published an edition of the Ignatian Epistles, in which he brings forward the readings and renderings of the Armenian version, published at Constantinople in 1783. He considers that the Armenian must have been translated from the Syriac, and not from the Greek. Hence he concludes that the Syriac version ought to contain all the Epistles, and that too according to the Medicean recension.

But there are difficulties in the way. Dr. Petermann cannot inform us of the age, the history, or the MSS. of the Armenian text, and even on his own showing it is in no very correct state. The editors mention that they have extruded some errors; but even if we were to admit as proved, what as yet is not proved, that it was made from a Syriac version, we should feel no surprise at a translation wholly different from that discovered by Mr. Cureton having been made into that language, after the Epistles had assumed the form found in the Medicean recension.

The Armenian version contains all the twelve Epistles ascribed to Ignatius, and also the one addressed to him by Maria of Cassobolita. If, then, this Armenian text be an evidence of anything, it is an evidence in favour of all the twelve, and not merely of the seven which so many have defended. Whether an ancient Syriac version resembling the Greek Medicean text ever existed, we cannot say. The *extracts* given by Mr. Cureton *prove* nothing of the kind;

Digitized by Google

kind; for with the exception of those from John the Monk, they occur in translations of works originally written in Greek. Denzinger has taken great pains to show that the citations *sometimes* accord with the Curetonian Syriac text, which he regards as a compilation. He ought, however, to have shown that the citations often *disagree* with that Syriac version. It is no wonder if a person who is acquainted with a translation into his own language should *sometimes*, from the mere force of *memory*, use the words of that translation when making a version in which such citations occur. Those who use Mr. Cureton's industry in the collection of Syriac extracts against himself, will find that the argument will suit their purpose very little. If they seek by these extracts to maintain the authority of the Medicean text of seven Epistles, they are bound to go farther, and to admit that the Syriac extracts are good evidence for Epistles which they themselves reject; but, in truth, the Syriac passages from Ignatian Epistles found in works translated from the Greek, prove *nothing*, except that such citations did occur in Greek authors.[u]

Many writers have spoken of the Medicean text as though it were identical with that mentioned by Eusebius. This has introduced a needless obscurity into these inquiries. The Medicean text presents to us some Epistles which Bishop Pearson and those

[u] Since these remarks were written, we have seen an able paper on the Ignatian Epistles from 'The New Englander' for November, 1849. In this article, by Dr. James Murdock (the translator of Mosheim), there are some excellent remarks on Dr. Petermann's supposed argument. After showing what Petermann's theory is, he says:—'But the general character which he himself gives of this version greatly weakens, if it does not destroy, his whole argument. For he admits that the Armenian version is a very loose one; that it is a kind of paraphrase, and that it extends, curtails, and alters the original, so as to give what the translator considered to be the *thought* in the author's mind rather than precisely what he wrote. Now such a translation, from whatever text it might be made, would be likely to coincide sometimes with the Greek, sometimes with the Syriac, and sometimes with neither. And precisely this, so far as we can judge, appears to be the fact. Notwithstanding the great ingenuity and erudition displayed by this editor, we are constrained to regard his reasoning as specious, but wholly inconclusive. But suppose we were compelled to admit that the Armenian version was made from a Syriac version, and as early as the *fifth* century; it would only follow, that in the *fifth* century there was a Syriac version of the thirteen Greek Epistles extant. Now there is reason to believe that these Epistles were then current among the Greek Christians; and they might have been translated into Syriac as they certainly were into Latin. But the existence in that age of the corrupted, interpolated, and forged Greek Epistles would be no proof that the shorter Epistles of the Cureton recension were not the only Epistles that Ignatius ever wrote, nor that the Cureton version was not made at an earlier age from an uncorrupted Greek original which contained substantially the primitive text of Ignatius.'—p. 8.

We may refer to the entirely different modes in which Syriac writers give the passage from the Epistle to the Magnesians chap. viii., as showing how improbable it is that *they* knew or used any Syriac translation of the Medicean Epistles. One gives it so as to make *the Word proceed from silence*; another, on the contrary, has, '*the eternal Word not proceeding from silence.*' They must just have followed the Greek that was before them.

who

Digitized by Google

who follow him agree in rejecting; and thus, if the authority of this text, as such, is upheld by those who receive *seven* Epistles, and seven only, they will find that they prove too much.

Thus Professor DENZINGER,[x] in his late book on the genuineness of the hitherto received text of the Ignatian Epistles, sets out with this statement:—

'Two different texts of the Epistles of the holy martyr and Bishop of Antioch, Ignatius, have been hitherto known. The one confessedly genuine, and agreeing with the quotations and testimonies of the ancients, namely, of Eusebius, contained seven epistles; the other, longer, has the same seven epistles with important interpolations, and besides five others, of which Eusebius makes no mention.'

To put these assertions properly, we should add that the seven shorter Epistles are *really intermixed* with at least four of the five *not* mentioned by Eusebius. So that, even if we took our stand on what that ecclesiastical historian states, we are forced to confess that no such *collection* of Epistles as that which he mentions has been transmitted to us. This is a conclusion very different from that which we find in most assertions on the subject. Let those who think that some Greek collection of seven Epistles has been handed down to us, inform us *where* and *how*. The simple fact is, that from amongst eleven or twelve Epistles, seven have been

---

[x] Ueber die Aechtheit des bisherigen Textes des Ignatianischen Briefe, von Heinrich Denzinger, Dr. der Philosophie und Theologie, u. s. w. Würtzburg, 1849.

Prof. Denzinger makes the radical mistake of other upholders of the Medicean text; he assumes one of the points to be proved, that there has been an actual diplomatic transmission of the seven shorter Greek Epistles *without the four others*.

His book is directed against Mr. Cureton's conclusions, and also against the deductions which the Chevalier Bunsen has drawn from the Syriac text. He wishes to defend the seven shorter Greek Epistles by showing that the Syriac Epistles agree with the shorter Greek as to their *doctrine* on the subject of the person of Christ, and also on the Hierarchy, and that the connection, &c. of the Greek Epistles shows that no interpolation has taken place. As to the person of Christ, Denzinger *does* show that the Syriac Epistles are perfectly orthodox, but this does *not* show that the *confessions of faith* introduced into the Greek are *genuine*, it only proves that there is no contradiction on this point.

As to the Hierarchy, it is not in question that the *fact* of Episcopacy is fully recognized in the Syriac Epistles; but this *fact* is a thing wholly different from the exaggerated assertions on the subject found in the Greek copies.

It is in vain to appeal to the supposed better connection of passages as found in the Greek text; an interpolator *may* do his work very neatly: even Denzinger is obliged to own that the Medicean text is not very pure.

The difficulty connected with the mention of the Valentinian *Sigè* is rather curiously avoided *in two ways;* 1st, by the allegation that the Valentinian nomenclature is older than Valentinus, and that the term *may* have sprung from Simon Magus; and 2nd, by the endeavour to show that in calling Christ 'the eternal word not having proceeded from *silence*,' there is no allusion to any Gnostic system of emanations!

Supernatural divine revelation is supposed by Denzinger sometimes, in order to avoid difficulties: Ignatius is thus exalted into a prophet.

selected

Digitized by Google

selected by critics as identical in name with those mentioned by Eusebius: their companions are duly condemned as spurious, and this might lead us to feel some doubt of the condition of the selected seven. If four or five forged productions have been mingled with them, we shall at least be reasonable if we doubt whether the forgers who have transmitted the whole together, may not have also interpolated the others. At least they would not be deterred on principle from doing this.

But it is said, Can we suppose the early Christians to have been so careless of the writings of Apostolic Fathers as not to have transmitted them with all purity? Is it conceivable that they would have *allowed* busy hands to tamper with the writings of *Ignatius*? Is such carelessness and indifference *credible*? Whether credible and conceivable or not, such is the fact. Peculiarly little care has been taken in the transmission of the writings of Ignatius. Forged Epistles have been transmitted as genuine, and interpolation *has* been carried on to a wonderful extent. Indeed, the larger Epistles in Greek have been transmitted to us with much more care than the smaller; for of the latter we possess merely the truncated Medicean MS., the Colbert MS. (from which the shorter Epistle to the Romans has been taken), and one small fragment besides. Had the Medicean MS. perished, where should we have turned for a Greek text to correspond to the Usherian Latin?

But, indeed, whatever may have been the cause, the writings of 'Apostolic Fathers' have been transmitted to us with very little care. Of the first Epistle of Clement we have no accessible copy[y] but that (with one hiatus) at the end of the Alexandrian MS.; of the ancient writing called the second Epistle of Clement, we have but a fragment; of Hermas, we have but a Latin version; the Epistle of Polycarp is blended in all the Greek copies extant with the document called the Epistle of Barnabas, so that the copyists have *fused* the text of the two into one unintelligible sentence—τὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντα, καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ τὸν λαὸν κενὸν ἐτομάζων. The last of these words, which belongs to Polycarp, is ὑπὸ. For

[y] We have now no means of ascertaining whether the *rumour* of a MS. of Clement's Epistles at Ferrara (see Tischendorf's *Rechenschaft*) be correct or not. At all events the MS. has not been used.

We may here state that we do *not* agree with the conclusions which Mr. Cureton draws (*Introd.* p. lxxiii.) as to the second Epistle of Clement, from the passage cited by Eusebius from the Letter of Dionysius of Corinth to the Romans. When Dionysius says to Soter, Bishop of Rome, that they have read the Epistle addressed to them from Rome, and also τὴν προτέραν ἡμῖν διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφεῖσαν, we believe with Dr. Routh that he means, not the *former* Epistle of Clement in contrast to his *second* (if he ever wrote a second),—but the *former* letter from Clement in the name of the Roman Church, in contrast to the latter which they had *just* received from the same Church.

the

Digitized by Google

the rest of his Epistle we are dependent on the Latin version, and a sentence in Eusebius.

This illustrates the manner in which copyists acted. They often transcribed what they could get, whether intelligible or not; and, besides this, many a work do we *owe* entirely to their mischievous diligence.[z] How much has been done since the revival of letters in the discovery and rejection of forgeries, such as the Epistles of Phalaris, Socrates, and Euripides. Transcribers often turned authors, using the name of some great or ancient person to stamp a value on their worthless forgeries; and such works sold. There was a demand for whatever bore the name of an esteemed author. Patristic writings came into existence in the book-makers' shops as soon as there was a demand for such productions; and in a time of controversy, a writing which bore the name of some great Father, and which *also* had a polemical value, was doubly acceptable. How many a Patristic work, which once passed as genuine, has had its true character exposed by critical and conscientious editors!

No wonder, then, that the name of Ignatius should be found prefixed to many Epistles which are *confessedly* not his. No wonder, if, with these facts before us, and with passages in other Epistles bearing the same name, which occasion insuperable difficulties, we should pause, and ask for *proof* that these Epistles are themselves altogether genuine and sincere.

Some recently-published remarks of Mr. Hussey, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford,[a] call for a brief notice before we conclude by stating the absolute grounds for receiving the three Epistles found in Syriac as genuine. Mr. Hussey sets out with a singular misapprehension of the state of the question. He says,—

'Mr. Cureton has attempted with great research to establish the conclusion, that out of the seven Epistles of St. Ignatius, which for about the last 150 years, since Bishop Pearson's Vindiciæ Ignatianæ appeared, have been generally considered to be exclusively genuine, only three are to be received as the writings of St. Ignatius, and the other four are forgeries.'

The singular misapprehension shown in this sentence *proves* that Mr. Hussey does not possess a comprehensive knowledge of the subject. That the seven Epistles have *not* been generally received

[z] How *extensively* has the name of the Apostolic Father, Clement, been used by busy and mischievous forgers, witness the many books to which his name has been appended!

[a] Sermons mostly Academical: *with a Preface containing a Refutation of the Theory founded upon the Syriac Fragments of the Epistles of St. Ignatius.* By Robert Hussey, B.D., &c. Oxford. MDCCCXLIX.

Digitized by Google

as genuine is one of the most commonly known facts on the subject.

Mr. Hussey pays high compliments to Mr. Cureton's scholarship and research. These compliments, however, have nothing to do with the point at issue.

Eusebius is the witness on whom Mr. Hussey specially rests; but all that can really be said to be *absolutely certain* as to Eusebius's evidence, is, that in his day seven Epistles bearing the name of Ignatius were current, and that he received them (doubtless in good faith) as genuine, and used them as such. One important fact must not be overlooked, that the citations from the Ignatian Epistles, found in the works of Eusebius, do not particularly accord with the often-defended shorter text. Mr. Cureton, in speaking of Eusebius's testimony, says that one of his principal objects in his history was to record the succession of Bishops—a point so certain that we are surprised that Mr. Hussey *seems* to question it. He speaks of Mr. Cureton having 'imputed motives' to Eusebius.

It is surprising that Mr. Hussey can speak so strongly of Jerome's testimony, as if it added anything to that of Eusebius, whom he copies. Jerome translates from Eusebius, but introduces strange confusion by omitting part of a sentence. It is difficult to suppose that Jerome possessed any independent knowledge of the subject, or that he investigated the critical points himself; and yet Mr. Hussey considers Jerome's testimony to be 'a confirmation of Eusebius.' As much a *confirmation* as a sentence *imperfectly translated* into a French newspaper is of the original paragraph in an English journal.

As to proof of the genuineness of the seven Epistles, Mr. Hussey appears to rest simply on Bishop Pearson. He does not meet the insuperable difficulties: he *assumes* they have been met.

Mr. Hussey objects to 'the refinements of practice' which we must suppose on the part of the interpolator, if the Medicean text be interpolated. He says that to believe in this skill 'would require greater credulity than it would to believe that the received text of the Epistles is the genuine writing of Ignatius.' Now, to say nothing farther of the *petitio principii* involved in the expression 'received text,' we have merely to point out that the 'refinements of practice' have been shown by the interpolator of the larger Epistles; and thus the argument, if it proves anything, would prove that *both* the longer and the Medicean recensions are equally incorrupt.

The theory which Mr. Hussey wishes to enforce, is, that the Syriac Epistles are extracts made for a pious use; but what can be said of the piety which makes extracts from a work, and so arranges

Digitized by Google

arranges them as to give them an appearance of completeness? The fact however is, that no inconsiderable argument in favour of the Syriac is founded on the impossibility of assigning any motive why such Epistles should have been framed out of either of the other recensions; while, on the contrary, we *know* that the hands of interpolators have played sad havoc with the writings of Ignatius.

One point which Mr. Hussey seeks to assail is the Syriac collection of three Epistles *as a collection.* He denies that the three Epistles stand as an entirety in Syriac. He says,—'I have noticed that two other nameless Epistles are reckoned among the Epistles of Ignatius in MS. γ'. There is another work of doubtful authority in the same volume with the MS. β'.' If this argument be worth anything, how will it apply to the Medicean text? Mr. Hussey must accept not only the cherished seven Epistles, but also the notoriously spurious ones with which they are there associated. But from Mr. Hussey's mode of stating the case, it would be difficult to understand the real condition of the Syriac MSS. The fact is, that amongst miscellaneous works an Epistle of Gregory Nazianzen, which some have deemed spurious, has found a place. But how can this affect the statement in another part of the Syriac volume:—'Here end *the three Epistles* of Ignatius, bishop and martyr'? Can anything be more plain than the fact that the transcriber intended to indicate that he at least looked on the three Epistles as one whole? And as to MS. γ', that does indeed contain a subscription, 'Here endeth what is of Ignatius,' after two letters of John the Monk—an error most certainly; but these two letters are not, in any title prefixed, ascribed to Ignatius, and the three Ignatian Epistles has each its own proper title and subscription. How different from the Greek and Latin texts, both shorter and longer, which add and mingle whole Epistles as if they were really Ignatian!

Mr. Hussey argues on what the Syrian Church knew on the subject. He supposes that because extracts from other nominally Ignatian Epistles are found in Greek works translated into Syriac, therefore the Syriac Church received all the Epistles which were received as genuine by the Greek Church; but on this principle both the Greek and Syriac Churches received more Epistles than the seven. All this idea about Church reception is, however, very doubtful. The Scriptures were given to the Church, who received them, used them, and publicly read them. The writings of Ignatius were merely the possession of individuals; and if we talk about the Epistles received by the Greek Church, then surely we must bring in all the twelve, or at least eleven, which the Greeks have transmitted? But this would not suit Mr. Hussey's theory.

In conclusion, Mr. Hussey joyfully avails himself of Peter-

Digitized by Google
mann's

mann's Armenian Researches, to which we have already alluded; but even if all that Petermann has advanced were substantiated, how little would it serve Mr. Hussey's theories. He would be obliged to admit the genuineness of all the twelve Epistles, in spite of the impossibilities with which this would be surrounded; for if a Syriac translation of twelve Epistles (if such ever existed) can be asserted to be a ground for rejecting a known Syriac version of three, then the transmission of the same twelve in Greek, Latin, and Armenian (and the asserted former existence in Syriac) is, at least, trebly conclusive against the selected seven, a seven which, as such, have not been transmitted at all!

Mr. Hussey concludes by congratulating himself on being the first (so far as he knows) who 'has yet fully pointed out the entire fallacy of that [Mr. Cureton's] learned argument;' but so far from having actually done this, he has only brought forward re-assertions on a subject, with the history of which he was but partially acquainted. There is no real '*refutation*' of any theory[b] founded on the Syriac Epistles.

We may now proceed to state the evidence on which we may rest confidently, with regard to Ignatius having been the author of the three Epistles which have been found in the Syriac translation.

The earliest mention of any Epistle written by Ignatius is contained in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians: he there says distinctly that Ignatius had written to him.

Irenæus also, in the same (the second) century, gives a passage found in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans, as that which had been said by a Christian condemned to the wild beasts: 'I am the corn of Christ, and by the teeth of the beasts am I ground, that I may be found pure bread of God.'

In the following century Origen cites expressly from Ignatius, 'My love hath been crucified,'—a sentence found in his Epistle to the Romans: he also quotes from an Epistle of Ignatius, 'The virginity of Mary was unknown to the prince of this world,' which forms part of a passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

These are all the citations of Ignatian Epistles prior to Eusebius; and it is at least remarkable, that the only quotations of the many Epistles which have since borne the name of that ancient martyr, are from those which in Syriac are preserved as though they formed a complete collection.

Eusebius mentions seven Epistles, and hence many have rested strongly upon him as an authority for defending seven Epistles

[b] From Mr. Hussey's use of the word 'theory,' we expected to have found a dissertation on theories of Church government which may have been based on the Syriac Epistles: *this* subject is one on which of set purpose we do not enter.

Digitized by Google bearing

bearing the same names. Eusebius, however, gives in a certain measure his authorities with regard to the genuineness of these Epistles: he refers to two of them having been mentioned or cited by Polycarp and Irenæus. It appears even from the statement of the ecclesiastical historian himself, that *we* stand in just as good a position as he did for forming a judgment on the authenticity of the seven Epistles which he mentions. The *use* which he makes of most of those that he cites, is simply to supply facts as to the order and succession of the Bishops in the respective Churches.

It may be said that it is very possible that these Epistles were known to the Fathers of the second and third centuries in a form such as they have in the Medicean MS.; had this, however, been the case, it is almost incredible that they should not have cited them in the course of certain arguments. This point has been forcibly stated by Mr. Cureton (Introd. p. lxxv.).

It must be admitted that there is distinct evidence for the authenticity of the three Epistles, to Polycarp, to the Ephesians and to the Romans: these *three* Epistles have come to us in three forms—the longer Greek, the shorter, and the Syriac. The first may be safely rejected as having been grossly interpolated; the question will then lie between the second and the third. Of these the one contains passages which savour of a later age, or which present difficulties of a kind almost (perhaps quite) insuperable; the other is free from these objections, is consistent with the age of Ignatius, and would not have been liable to attack, were it not that the other recension has been *supposed* to possess some prescriptive rights. How futile is this supposition we have already shown.

Further, the Syriac recension accords with the remarks on style,[c] connection, and tone of thought made by acute critics ages before it was discovered; it thus *confirms* previous observations in a very remarkable manner.

Which, then, shall we say; that the Syriac Epistles are ex-

[c] Some pretend to acuteness on the subject of *style, &c.*, who are *really* most superficial. Prof. Norton, in his work entitled 'The Genuineness of the Gospels,' devotes a long note (twenty-two pages in the English edition) to the Apostolic Fathers and their professed writings. He impugns all the Epistles ascribed to Ignatius, without appearing to know anything of Mr. Cureton's (already published) labours. He says:—'The sentiments ascribed to Ignatius present a rude caricature of a very weak, half-crazy, vain-glorious bigot,' &c.; and in a note he adds, 'See particularly the whole of the Epistle to the Romans.' It happens, however, that this Epistle to the Romans is the very one which *Neander* has pointed out as possessing more decided marks of originality than the others! So much for Norton's penetration! And this Epistle has on the whole been spared in a great measure by the interpolators. This may lead to some doubt as to Norton's suggestions on other subjects (the Old Testament for instance) as far as style, &c. are concerned. Norton, however, would find the Syriac Epistles as little in accordance with his denial of the Godhead and atonement of Christ, as the Greek of which he complains so much.

Digitized by Google

tracts made in an early age by some critic, who, with unparalleled prescience, anticipated the objections made a thousand years later, and avoided the difficulties afterwards discovered; or shall we say that the Syriac Epistles are simply a genuine translation of a genuine collection? If we do not adopt the latter alternative, we shall be assailed by yet farther difficulties, for we should then have to account for the exquisite tact of the Syrian critic in selecting the three Epistles, and those only which possessed *early external* testimony.

We may add one remark on diplomatic transmission; the *antiquity* of the Syriac MSS., and the simple manner in which they present three Epistles as a complete collection, must not be overlooked. As to the MSS., the three Epistles in Syriac stand on a ground *far higher* than the Greek in any form. This is evidence which partakes of the character of internal and of external.

The three Epistles in Syriac stand, in opposition to all the others, on a far simpler ground of authentication than very many of the undoubted productions of antiquity.

Mr. Cureton has given the strongest reasons for concluding that Origen *could* not have been acquainted with the Epistle to the Smyrnæans; hence Origen, who was acquainted with Ignatian Epistles, is a witness *against* the collection mentioned by Eusebius: as a collection it must have come into existence between the ages of these two writers.

It may be said that none of the considerations which have been advanced *demonstrate* that the four other Epistles, mentioned by Eusebius, were not written by Ignatius. We admit that Ignatius *may* have written to the Magnesians, Trallians, Philadelphians, and Smyrnæans; but the admission of this *possibility* is very different from an acknowledgment that the Medicean text of these Epistles *can* have proceeded from the hand of that ancient martyr. The difficulties and incongruities involved in the supposition are insuperable. Besides, the tone and style of those Epistles correspond so accurately with those portions of the other three Epistles, whose spuriousness is now demonstrated by both internal and external evidence, as to show the same hand and mind.

We may here also state that the grounds on which we long ago supposed that those critics were probably right who regarded the two Greek recensions as being *both* interpolated texts, are not applicable to the four Epistles now under consideration. These Epistles do not contain any long passages in which the Medicean text differs altogether from the longer: there is nothing resembling the later chapters of the Epistle to the Ephesians. Thus

Digitized by Google

Thus these Epistles, looked at *per se*, stand on a different ground from the well-attested three.

If Ignatius did write any four Epistles to the four Churches of which we are now speaking, we possess no clue by which to distinguish what he may have actually written. All that professes to be his bears the stamp of such a forger as the writer, who, in adding to the Epistle to the Ephesians, took care to give a kind of authentication to the forgeries which he contemplated. Had the doctrinal treatise, which Ignatius—a close prisoner, and about to suffer martyrdom—is made to propose writing, come down to us, it would no doubt be as inane and abstract as much of what has improperly borne his name. It seems to us, however, that the forger turned his thoughts in a new direction, and thus city after city was honoured with an Epistle, as if from Ignatius; perhaps this was found a more profitable speculation as to pecuniary patronage.

In no form, then, can we contemplate these four Epistles as genuine *until* they are presented to us devoid of impossible circumstances, and free from passages which we cannot attribute to Ignatius. *When* such a recension is brought to light we may consider its claims; *till* then we may safely abide by the judgment which Mr. Cureton has stated and *proved* in his notes on these Epistles.—pp. 326-337.

Mr. Cureton says but little on the Epistles which bear the name of Ignatius but which are *not* mentioned by Eusebius; he leaves the question undetermined whether that Father was acquainted with them or not. However, we may be sure that if Eusebius were acquainted with the Epistles to the Tarsians, Antiochians, Hero, and the Philippians, he must have rejected them as spurious. They all contain passages against those who assert our blessed Lord to be 'a mere man,' ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος:[d] an opinion which, according to Eusebius himself (*H. E.* v. 28) was first maintained by Theodotus the currier, of unenviable notoriety. Thus Eusebius *knew* that this heresy could not have been opposed by the real Ignatius; the other Epistle of the five not mentioned by Eusebius, that to Maria of Cassobolita, in which 'the blessed

[d] Καὶ οὔτε ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος ὁ δι' οὗ καὶ ἐν ᾧ γέγονε τὰ πάντα (*Tars.* vi.) πῶς οὖν ὁ τοιοῦτος ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος · · ἀλλ' οὐχὶ θεὸς λόγος, κ. τ. λ. (*ib.*) Ὁ τε ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγων τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπάρατός ἐστιν, κ. τ. λ. (*Ant.* v.) Εἴ τις ἄνθρωπον ψιλὸν λέγῃ τὸν Κύριον, Ἰουδαῖός ἐστι χριστοκτόνος. (*Hero* ii.) Εἰ γὰρ ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος ὁ Κύριος, κ. τ. λ. (*Philip.* v). This Epistle to the Philippians is very exact in directions as to *fasting* on Wednesday and Friday; they are commanded to 'fast twice in the week' as scrupulously as the Pharisee in our Lord's Parable. On the other hand, 'Whoever fasts on the Lord's day or the Sabbath [*i. e.* Saturday] except the one Paschal Sabbath, he is χριστοκτόνος'!!! A *large portion* of the Epistle (six chapters out of fifteen) are not addressed to the Philippians at all, but are *an apostrophe to Satan!*

Digitized by Google

Pope Linus,' etc, is spoken of, is little likely to have existed in Eusebius's days.

It must be remembered that whatever shows that these Epistles not mentioned by Eusebius are spurious, weakens thoroughly the arguments which *might* have been alleged in favour of seven in the Medicean text, for there they stand on equal grounds of authenticity; and if the *authority* of the Medicean MS. be given up, we may search in vain for any text to be defended even for seven Epistles.

Indeed, the longer Greek text possesses far stronger claims on the ground of MS. transmission, than the shorter; but still, whoever defends seven Epistles, because seven are mentioned by Eusebius, has to show where and how they have been transmitted; and he should not assume that by taking *part* of a collection, of which so much is notoriously spurious, he can present precisely the Epistles of which Eusebius spoke, and in the state in which he knew them.

Much has been done since the revival of letters in sifting evidence, and thus rejecting those works which are certainly supposititious. Some have *feared* lest critical care of this kind should lead to the rejection of some books of Holy Scripture: these fears are wholly groundless; and it is degrading to the broad, evident lines of Christian evidence, for such suggestions even to be made. The rejection of the mass of Ignatian Epistles as spurious, leaves the three in the Syriac version with their genuineness all the more evident; there is the same kind of contrast as to testimony, as that which exists between the genuine books of the New Testament and the profane productions of forgers.*

We have given a brief review of the points at issue on the subject of these Epistles. We must refer to Mr. Cureton's volume as presenting the information fully and satisfactorily.

Many literary questions have been raised and many points have been defended with much ingenuity; to some it has seemed as if there was really much to be said for either side; and yet, after the whole discussion has been calmly considered by competent scholars, no doubt whatever is felt as to the actual result. It was thus in the controversy on the Epistles of Phalaris, and

* Mr. Hussey says, in speaking of the MSS. of the Epistles in Syriac, 'No one of these three MSS. contains anything positive tending to condemn other Epistles of Ignatius, beyond the expressions in the titles, "the Epistles of Ignatius," or "the three Epistles" of Ignatius, and in the end of one collection, "here end the Epistles of Ignatius." ' (p. xiv.) This can hardly be called an *argument;* shall we say that the MSS. of the four Gospels supply us with statements, that *other* Gospels are apocryphal? Mr. Hussey ought first to *prove* that it is probable that the Syriac translator knew of more Epistles.

also

Digitized by Google

also with regard to the long-defended text 1 John v. 7. A certain length of *time*, however, is needed before such a result is reached. We expect, however, to see the day when a scholar would as soon think of impugning the conclusions of Bentley, with regard to the Epistles of Phalaris, as those of Mr. Cureton on those of Ignatius.

We may yet have to notice particulars of this controversy from time to time. There are two points, however, not to be called in question: 1st. That the genuineness of seven Epistles in the Medicean text has *not* been commonly admitted; and 2ndly. That no collection of seven Epistles has been transmitted to us in any form. A clear apprehension of these two indubitable points might serve to remove encumbrances from the discussion.

ON THE

HEBREW POETRY OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

I. The sublime nature of Hebrew poetry is acknowledged by all who have ears to hear and hearts to feel the melodious harmony and the thrilling inspirations of creative verse. Equal, in all the higher qualities of the art, with the best productions of ancient or modern times, it surpasses all in majesty of subject, in grandeur of style, in fertility of invention, and intense spirituality. So does it, also, in that fervent devotional spirit, which lies scattered here and there among the poets of Greece and Rome. The bards of Sion, more sublime and spiritual, hear 'the heavens declare the glory of God: and the firmament show his handy work;' and although 'there is neither speech nor language,' their voices are heard among them.[a]

But while the peculiar grandeur of the inspired poetry of the Bible is appreciated even by those who can view it only through a translation, the number is very few of those who know that the Hebrew language has any other poetry worthy of attention. Yet it is a fact that the middle ages are rich in the productions of the Jewish muse; and it is the object of these pages to indicate the nature and quality of these productions.

An eminent orientalist of our own times, Professor Munk of Paris, in his interesting 'Essay on the Poetry of the Jews during the Middle Ages,' says that at a period when Europe was plunged in the darkness of ignorance and barbarism, when senseless wars

[a] Psalm xix. 1. and 3.

Digitized by Google

and

and accumulated horrors of fire and the sword devastated the fairest countries of the world; the Hebrew poets of the middle ages 'found in their sufferings that sublime inspiration which characteristically distinguishes them from Arab writers. Their elegies, bearing the very hue of melancholy; their prayers and odes, breathing the purest sentiments of religion and a touching resignation; their lessons of morality and wisdom, gathered amidst tombs and ruins, will find a responsive echo in every feeling heart, for they contain thoughts and emotions fit for every land and every age.' He then gives the contents of a poem composed in those times, and since received by all Hebrew communities, as one of the elegies to be chanted on the 9th day of Ab, the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple[b] and city of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. The 9th of Ab is a mournful day among the children of Israel, being the anniversary of many awful calamities that befel their people on that day. By a singular coincidence, too powerfully marked to be called accidental, on the first of these several memorable days the people revolted against Moses and Aaron;[c] on the same day of the same month, nine hundred years after that rebellion, Nebuchadnezzar burned and destroyed their city and made captives of their leading men; and again on the 9th day of Ab, the Romans under Titus destroyed their city and sanctuary, fulfilling the prediction of the prophet Micah (iii. 12), that Zion should be 'ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest.' And when, half a century later, Bar Chochebas involved his nation in a dreadful calamity, by attempting to rescue his country from the abomination of paganism, which had been established in Jerusalem by Hadrian, it was again on the 9th day of Ab. Taking advantage of the indignation of his countrymen, Bar Chochebas proclaimed himself Messiah by the aid of the celebrated Rabbi Akiba, and in order to accommodate himself to the anger and prejudices of the people, spoke of nothing but wars, battles, and triumphs; the first lesson of this pseudo-Messiah being the necessity of a general rising against the Romans. He fortified himself and his deluded followers in many places, and chose the city of Better or Bether for his seat of empire. Rufus, the governor of Judea, attempted to quell these disturbances, but, although he committed great cruelties, he did not succeed. Julius Severus, the greatest general of his time, was sent by Hadrian against the Jews, and adopt-

[b] 'Judah shall fall, oppress'd by grief and shame;
And men shall from her ruins know her fame.'—Prior.

[c] Num. xiv. 1, 2.

Digitized by Google ing

ing the policy of attacking and cutting them off separately, reduced the whole war to the memorable siege of Bether, the last resource and stronghold of Bar Chochebas and his followers. The city was stormed and captured, and the blood of the leader and of six hundred thousand Jews, of all ages and sexes, glutted the inhuman vengeance of Hadrian.

The 9th day of Ab is, therefore, a day to be remembered by the Hebrews, as the anniversary of so many recurring instances of divine vengeance against rebellions and crimes, and as such is still commemorated with sad and mournful solemnities.

This poem is entitled 'Sion,' an elegy on the fall of Jerusalem, and was written by Rabbi Jehuda Hallevi, who was slain by an Arab during his recital of its plaints over the ruins of the sacred city.

It would be in vain to attempt a description of the eulogiums heaped upon this pillar of the mediæval Hebrew poetry, by the Rabbins who were his contemporaries, as well as by successive critics and commentators. 'He alone,' says one[d] of the ablest of his panegyrists, 'penetrated into the sanctuary of poesy. The gates of heaven had been locked by the grandeur of the empyrean, but the genius of Jehuda boldly shattered their bars. How our souls are uplifted by the force of his prayers! His love-songs flow like dew from his lips, and still throw fire into our hearts. O! listen to his elegies! and the mist of your tears will pour down in torrents.'

'Sion.'*

'Sion! wilt thou not inquire the fate of thy captive children? Art thou insensible to the fervent acclamations which the remnant of thy flock send towards thee from all the corners of the earth?

'From east to west, from north to south, in exile and in captivity, they direct their anxious looks to thee, they pant for hope, and pay to thee the tribute of their tears.

'Our tears fall swiftly, like dew upon Mount Hermon: Oh! could they water thy dearest hills! When I weep over thy tremendous fall, it resembles the howling of jackals; but when I dream of our return from bondage, I hear the tuneful accents of the harp; such as on festive days accompanied our sacred songs.

'My heart flies towards the house of God, and rises into the presence of the Creator. Were not heaven's gates opened *here?* Did not the majesty of our God, on this spot, darken the lustre of the sun and stars? Oh that I were permitted to send forth my soul in this

---

[d] Professor Munk of Paris.

* ציון

א ציון הלא תשאלי את שלום

&c. אסיריך

Digitized by Google

place

place where the spirit of God descended upon his chosen people. Thou, O Sion! wert the residence of the eternal King, and now, behold! slaves pollute the throne of thy princes.

'Why cannot my spirit hover above the sacred spots, where the awful presence of the Deity appeared to thy prophets? Give me but wings to carry the fragments of my heart to yonder holy ruins, and I would cleave to thy silent rocks.

'My brow should touch thy sacred dust in adoration; and my foot should rest upon the tombs of my forefathers. I would contemplate the holy cave of Hebron; mine eyes should dwell upon the Mount Abarim and upon Mount Hor, which cover my sainted guides, the luminaries of Israel.

'In thy pure air I should breathe the breath of life; in thy plains I should inhale the perfume of myrrh; in thy streams I should sip the sweets of honey.

'How should I delight in treading barefooted the ruins of thy sanctuary, to stand upon the spot where the earth opened to receive into her trusty bosom the Ark of the Covenant with its guardian cherubim.

'Ah! from my head I could tear the hair that forms its ornament; in my despair I could curse the decree which threw thy adoring sons upon an unholy shore.

'How can I enjoy life when I see thy lions, O Judah, dragged into dens by dogs? How can I bear the light of day when it shows me vultures feeding upon the dead bodies of thy saints?

'Stay, O cup of my sufferings, but one short moment stay, let me repose awhile. My veins are already filled with bitterness; let me reflect, although but for a moment, upon Ohola,[f] and I will take thy goblet; but one thought upon Oholiba[g] and I will drink it to the dregs.

'Sion! crown of beauty! remember the tender love of thy inhabitants for thee; thy happiness filled them with joy, thy reverses filled them with grief. From the dark recesses of their prison they incline their hearts towards thee, and bow themselves in prayer to thy gates.

'Fear not; thy flocks, dispersed upon the hills, have not forgotten their native fold: they unconsciously languish for thy verdant heights, and yearn for the shade of thy noble palm-trees.

'What are Sincar and Pathros, in their empty greatness, compared to thee? What are their deceiving oracles in the eyes of those who know of thy divine Urim and Thummim?

'Is there a mortal daring enough to enter into comparison with thy princes, prophets, Levites, and sacred singers? All empires shall vanish and fall; but thou alone shalt stand unto the end of ages, for thou art the dwelling place of the eternal Lord.

'Happy mortal, who could rest under the shelter of thy protecting walls! thrice happy mortal who will be present at the dawn of thy returning day! He will mingle with the chosen number of thy happy

[f] Samaria. [g] Jerusalem.

Digitized by Google ones.

ones, he will rejoice at thy rejoicings, and he will see the pride of thy beauty as in the days of thy youth.'

These were the last words of the song of Sion's mourner, whose history and connection with the great body of rich and learned Jews that flourished in Spain during the time of the Crusades is mentioned hereafter. Having composed his elegy, he determined in the fiftieth year of his age to undertake a pilgrimage from the heart of Andalusia to the devastated city of Jerusalem, then in the possession of the Crusaders, with the intention of reciting it upon the ruins which it lamented, eleven hundred years after its destruction by Titus.

When he came in sight of the holy mountain whereon his forefathers had worshipped the great Jehovah, he rent his clothes, pulled off his shoes, and entered the holy city barefooted. Thus humiliated and with ashes cast upon his head, he commenced reciting his elegy in melancholy strains. Completely absorbed by his subject, he did not observe that his dress and occupation had excited the attention of a mounted Arab; nor did he hear the taunts with which the rude horseman commanded him to cease his melancholy lamentations. Enraged at the disobedience of the enrapt enthusiast, he spurred his horse over the unfortunate bard, and trampled him to death.

In alluding to these memorable ruins, an eminent German[h] philosopher and poet says, 'Probably these ruins will still live for centuries in the memory of men; millions will still there find types for true or imaginary consolation, hopes, presentiments, prophecies; for they are deeply rooted in the very heart of old Time, and claim their authority from the instructions of our youth.'

It is related in an able work[i] on 'The Customs and Observations of the Jews,' that their celebrated *Tanai* (teacher) Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph (whose connection with their pseudo-Messiah Bar Chochebas is mentioned before[k]), and some of his disciples, were passing the ruins of the temple, a jackal came out from the most holy part, where the glory of the Lord had been in times past enshrined over the cherubim. The young men began to weep bitterly at the sight, but Rabbi Akiba burst into laughter. The astonished disciples exclaimed, 'Rabbi, why dost thou laugh?' 'Why do you weep?' was his reply. 'How can we refrain from weeping,' they answered, 'when we see the glorious and holy temple of the Lord laid in ashes, the idolatrous heathen

---

[h] JOHANN GOTTFRIED VON HERDER, author of *Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* and many other much admired works.

[i] *The Hebrew Review*, vol. ii. p. 303.

[k] Page 374.

lording

Digitized by Google

lording it over the venerated ruins, and that most sacred spot, THE HOLY OF HOLIES, where the Lord of the universe deigned visibly to dwell—that spot now the abode of unclean animals! How is it possible that the eyes which see this destruction and desecration, caused by our own sins and those of our ancestors, should abstain from shedding abundant tears, or the oppressed bosom from giving vent to its poignant grief?'

'Aye!' said the Rabbi, 'the Prophet said,[m] "The mountain of Sion is desolate; jackals walk upon it:" and ye weep because ye have seen this fearful denunciation accomplished. But the same prophet has likewise said,[n] "Thus saith the Lord; behold I will bring again the captivity and have mercy on his dwelling-places; and the city shall be builded upon her own heap (*or ruins*), and the palace (*or Temple of the Lord*) shall be restored to its former manner. And out of them shall proceed thanksgiving and the voice of them that make merry; and I will multiply them and they shall not be few; I will glorify them and they shall not be small. Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me, and I will punish all that oppress them." Thus, our happy restoration is foretold by the same infallible authority that foretold our lamentable degradation. And when I behold how strictly and literally the denunciations of divine justice are accomplished, I rejoice to think that the promises of divine mercy will not be less strictly and literally fulfilled.'

For ages preceding this period the learned Jews had greatly neglected the pure Biblical Hebrew of their forefathers, and it had ceased to be a vernacular language among them. With all their pious care to preserve the purity of the sacred text, their writings abounded in Chaldaisms, faulty grammar, and corrupt Hebrew. Hence arises the difference between the Biblical and the Rabbinical Hebrew, and the necessity of a dictionary for each dialect.

But in the splendid period[o] of Jewish literature, a spirit of reform arose among the Rabbis. Many of them, particularly the celebrated Maimonides, wrote their ethics,[p] their commentaries on the Scriptures, their poetry in the rich, beautiful, copious and mellifluent language of the Arabians, translated by them or their disciples into Rabbinical Hebrew for general use. This period was among the most palmy days of Arabian and Rabbinical poetry.

The Rabbis began now to be patriotically ashamed of their

[m] Lamentations v. 18. [n] Jeremiah xxx. 18 *et seq.*

[o] The beginning of the twelfth century.

[p] מסכת אבות *Mescheth Aboth*, the Ethics of the Fathers.

neglect

Digitized by Google

neglect of their mother-tongue and of allowing the language of the descendants of Hagar to surpass that of the children of Sarah. They made many and great efforts to restore the barbarous Hebrew, then in use, to its native purity, but at the same time could not avoid introducing many of the elegancies and grammatical niceties of the Arabian language into their own. 'They fettered,' says Professor Munk, 'the soaring genius of their writers by rules too rigid, particularly by adapting to their own,' that is, the Biblical, 'Hebrew, which consisted altogether of no more than about six thousand words, the strictness barely applicable to the rich Arab language. Still the good effects were immense which their endeavours produced on the Hebrew students, whose admiration of the Arabian language had been carried to the baneful extreme of creating a contempt for the Bible.'

The eminent Rabbi Al-Charisi[r] complains in strong terms of the corruptions which had arisen from the readiness with which the Jews had deserted the language of their ancestors to offer incense at the shrine of strange gods. He says, 'A feeling of jealousy, but of no ignoble kind, seized my soul, when I saw wisdom turning away from us; when I beheld the lovely children, the fruit of Hagar, and compared them with the sterility of Sarah. Then,' according to the words[s] of this Hebrew poet and critic, 'Sarah, hitherto simple and chaste, decked herself out with all the worthless pomp of Hagarene ornaments—alliteration, assonance, rhyme, and prosody, with all the niceties of Arabian appendages;—in short, the whole formidable retinue which attended the Musselman style, are forced upon the language of the Hebrews.'

How forcibly do these complaints of the spirit of innovation, or of improving the pure text of the law and the prophets, by commentators, explainers, and perplexers among the Rabbis, ethical fathers, and Talmudists, among the Jews, remind us of a similar complaint made by a learned and pious[t] doctor of the Anglican Church against 'the triflings of many of the later schoolmen, who promoted a petty interest of a family, or an unlearned opinion with great earnestness, but added nothing to Christianity but trouble, scruple, and vexation.' To purify the Bible from the legends of the overwhelming Talmudists, and to cleanse the Gospel from the fables of the Romanists,[u] would simplify theology

---

[r] In his *Tach-kemoni*, written about A.D. 1210.

[s] See his seven rules or points of poetry hereafter, page 384.

[t] Bishop Jeremy Taylor in the preface to his inimitable *Life of Christ*, sec. 42.

[u] 'Nihil autem magis congruit cum hominis naturâ quàm Christi philosophia quæ penè nihil aliud agit quàm ut naturam collapsam suæ restituat innocentiæ.'—Erasmus, in xi. cap. Matt.

and

Digitized by Google

and be the restitution and perfection of the religion of nature. The Talmudists are the Papists of Judaism, as the Papists are the Talmudists of Christianity; both professing their schools to be loving mothers, but so overgrown and weighty are they that they have overlain their children.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries of the Christian era, when Arabian literature had reached its zenith, was also the period when the divine spirit of poetry arose among the Rabbis; and a considerable list of their poets of those days attests their excellence. One only of them need be named in this brief sketch of the subject, to prove how excellent were their works.

The youthful Salomon ben Gabirol, says our preceding authority (Professor Munk), excelled chiefly in the ode. His fertile muse sang the wonders of nature and the motions of the heavenly spheres. In his 'Kethur Malchuth' (*Heavenly Crown*), he has left a poetical summary of the Aristotelian cosmology. The adoration paid to the Stagyrite, in those days, by the Arabian and Jewish schoolmen is everywhere perceptible; and even when ben Gabirol raised his contemplations to the God of Israel, he could not abstain from indirectly offering his homage to the idol of his age. A similar homage was paid to this great philosopher by the Christian schoolmen in the twilight of the middle ages, who raised the ethnic casuist to the dignity of umpire between the Athanasian orthodoxy and the Arian heresy, and make him a judge over St. Paul, and second only to Christ himself. A recent historian of the period in question says, that to Aristotle the Papists added St. Augustin, selecting the most thorny and disputable points of the pagan and the Christian as the ground-work of the art of reasoning, and pithily observes that this was not the art of reasoning, but the art of abusing reason. For instance, they discussed the interior construction of Paradise, as if it were as accessible and as well known as Windsor Castle; whether Jesus Christ ascended into heaven in his clothes, and whether his body as administered in the sacrament is clothed or unclothed! Surely nothing in the Talmud can surpass these Christian casuists, nor prove the necessity of abandoning the dogmas of such teachers, by those who would read the law and the prophets, and the gospel, which is the accomplishment of both in purity and truth. Well is it for this enlightened age that we require neither Talmuds, Fathers, nor philosophers to strengthen the light of Holy Scripture, which those may read who run.

As a fair specimen of the ideas which prevail in the poems of

---

[x] M. Capefigue, in his *Histoire de Philippe-Auguste*. Ouvrage couronné par l'Institut. 4 vols. 8vo., Paris, 1830.

ben

Digitized by Google

ben Gabirol, the following lines taken from Professor Munk's Essay may suffice:—

'Chase thy cares from thee, my afflicted soul! why should the adversities of this world afflict thee?

'Soon will thy frail covering repose in the tomb, and all will be forgotten.

'Man is a vine, and Death the vintager, who carefully watches when the fruit is ripe for gathering.

'Time is short, the road is long; forget thy troubles, think but of the grave, and fear nought but the day of judgment.'

The poet was gathered to the vintage at the blooming age of thirty. He fell under the dagger of an assassin, who, it was generally believed, was driven to this execrable deed by jealousy at the superior talent of his victim.

The sad death of this youthful poet was no less afflictive to his people than was the cruel end of the older enthusiast, the before-mentioned Rabbi Jehuda. When the news of the sage's death reached home it appalled all his friends in Spain; his son-in-law, Ebn Ezra, whose romantic marriage with the great poet's daughter is mentioned hereafter,[y] sanctified his memory with a poet's offering. An extract from it will serve as a specimen[z] of the hyperbolical language used by the most elegant writers of that day:—

'If my tears flowed according to the immensity of my grief, no man could find a resting place for his foot;[a] but as the covenant of the Lord rose above the waters of Noah; so He also hath showed a rainbow upon my tears.'

Every description of poetry is to be found in that of the Hebrew nation, from songs of Sion, and those which they sang in strange lands, wherein these

'Tribes of the wandering foot and weary breast'[b]

hanged their harps upon the trees and wept by the rivers of Babylon, in soft elegiac strains, laments for Judah, to love-ditties, wine-songs, and facetiæ.

During these ages, when the study of war and arms superseded

---

[y] *Vide posteà*, p. 386.

[z] From Professor Munk's essay.

[a] This Hebrew hyperbole is almost equalled in an Italian extravaganza by Mrs. Thicknesse, the accomplished and beautiful author of *Biographical Sketches of Literary Females of the French Nation*, to the beautiful Lady Coventry:—

'Se tutti gli alberi del mondo
Fossaro penne
Il cielo fosse carta,
Il mare inchiostro,
Non basterenne a discrivere
La minima parte delle vostre perfezzione.'

[b] Byron.

Digitized by Google

literary pursuits in Europe, the Jews had schools and colleges of learning in Africa, Syria, and Asia Minor, among which those of Damascus, Rhodes, Aleppo, and Alexandria were the most celebrated—in Spain, those of Arragon, Navarre, Castile, Catalonia, Saragossa, Burgos, Cordova, Toledo, Tarragona, Lucena, which was the nursery, and places of minor note, all governed and frequented by the greatest men among the Spanish Jews—in France there were similar establishments at Provence, Montpelier, Narbonne, Lunel, Marseilles, and Troyes. In Italy, Mantua, Lucca, and others.

Among the learned and poetical Jews of this interesting period were R. R. Isaac Alphes, Salomon Gabriol Al-Charizi, Jehuda Hallevi, Ebn Ezra, David Kimchi, Maimonides, Nachmanides, Rabenu Beckai, Badrashi, Isaac Lateph, and a long list of others, celebrated in every species of Oriental literature.

Many of these eminent persons rank high as philosophers, philologists, physicians, and astronomers; some were excellent mathematicians, and many of them were highly gifted poets. For five centuries[c] did these eminent men support in Spain a character for learning and civilization scarcely to be paralleled in modern history. Many of them cultivated and promoted the study of Arabian literature at the expense of their native Hebrew, and occasioned a schism among the Rabbis which was warmly supported on both sides.

The literature of the Arabians at this period, and their ardent pursuit of Greek learning, had been long transplanted into Spain by the Moors. When Bagdad was on the decline, the wealthy and influential caliphs of the Ommiade dynasty invited the greatest of the Arabian literati into Spain. They selected Cordova for their residence, and pursued their studies in philosophy, chemistry, mathematics, poetry, and other branches of elegant and useful learning, for more than two centuries, till their expulsion from Spain: hence arises the similarity between the Hebraic and Arabic poetry of these ages.

The Jews of France, Poland, and Germany in the middle ages, on the contrary, despised profane knowledge, and looked upon all who cultivated poetry, philosophy, or any branch of human knowledge, except the Talmud, as frivolous triflers, who abused the time and talents which God had given them, and branded them with the epithets Epicurean and infidel. As stated by the late Mr. D'Israeli, 'The Israelites in Poland and Germany live with all the restriction of their ceremonial law, in an insulated state; and are not always instructed in the language of the country

[c] From A.D. 890 until their forcible expulsion from that kingdom in 1492.

of

Digitized by Google

of their birth:' so was it in the middle ages, which was the cause of the superiority in literature and arts of the Jews in Spain and Africa.

One instance among many will suffice to prove the influence and learning of the Jews in this period. The great talents of Rabbi Isaac, ben Jacob, ben Baruch, ben Akalia (such were his names and pedigree), in every branch of science, particularly in astronomy, gained him the friendship of Abûl-Cassem ebn Abad, called Al-mothamad (*the mathematician*), king of Seville, who appointed him to a high and confidential employment in his household. He became also chief Rabbi to the Jewish community in Seville. These dignities he held for nearly twenty years, until the victories of Joseph ben Taschfin, king of Morocco, put an end to the royal dynasty of Seville, which, together with all Moorish Spain, was subjugated by the Africans. Rabbi Isaac found an asylum in Granada, where he pursued his studies till his death in 1094.

Among the celebrated men of this period was Rabbi Abraham ben Dioz, the nephew and pupil of Rabbi Baruch. His fame as an historian is preserved by his 'ANNALS,' to which his successors are chiefly indebted for their knowledge of the men and events of those days.

The intention of this dissertation is to select the poets from their illustrious colleagues in other branches of literature, and to those it will be confined. Among the greatest poets and critics of this period was Rabbi JEHUDA HALLEVI, already mentioned. He was born about A.D. 1100, of rich and pious parents, and descended from a family celebrated for its virtues and learning. Possessed of great natural abilities, and educated in his paternal home with the greatest care, he entered the Jewish college at Lucena, when that institution was in its most palmy state, and boasted of a host of masters and disciples of the highest character. Rabbi Salomon ben Gabirol was then the greatest poet and master of his art of the day. He reared many pupils of distinguished excellence, whom he instructed by means of melodious verse; and at the same time imprinted on their minds a knowledge of and love for their duties, through the means of sublime didactic poetry and inspiring odes. None of his pupils ever equalled their master until the youthful Jehuda took up the inspired pen of his teacher.

The masterly productions of Hallevi soon became admired, and were universally allowed to surpass the best productions of his great prototype, whose footsteps he closely followed. His wealth afforded him leisure to correct his poems and to give them that degree of finished perfection that the laws of prosody require and his learning enabled him to bestow. 'He left all other Hebrew

Digitized by Google

poets far behind him,' writes the most[d] eminent Hebrew critic of his day, 'and exhausted the fulness of poetic treasure. His odes abound in loftiness and fire; in his elegies a strain of soft melancholy and tender lamentation seizes upon the soul and compels the sympathetic tears to flow; his similes strike the mind by their appositeness; his style by its clearness and the lucid arrangement of his subject; and on every line he writes, the most sublime philosophy, the most profound knowledge of the world and of mankind, and the most ardent love of truth have stamped their impress, so that he satisfies every demand that can be made upon the poet.'

The high demands which this great critic makes upon the poet, and which he asserts that HALLEVI has satisfied in full, he has embodied in seven articles, which will not only give a general view of the state of poetry among the Jews in the middle ages, but may fairly be called—

'AL-CHARIZI'S ART OF POETRY.'[e]

'I. The poet must abstain from every barbarism of expression, and maintain his language in the highest purity.

'If he neglects this rule he will resemble the Greek Jews, who disfigure the purity of their poems by mixing Grecian weeds among their Hebrew flowers.

'II. He must pay strict attention to the metre, so that his syllables be not sometimes long and sometimes short, without any attention to quantity.

'If he neglects to observe this, he will resemble those modern poets, who, ignorant of the art of versification, sometimes lengthen and sometimes shorten their lines in the most irregular manner, producing verses which grate upon the practised ear, and afford no pleasure to the common reader.

'III. The subject of his poem must be fixed and uniform, worthy of the poet's ardour, and instructive to mankind.

'The Babylonians wrote verses which, on account of their frivolity, are altogether worthless.

'IV. The poet must write in a clear and lucid manner, free from every kind of obscurity or confusion of language.

'The French Jews write with such total disregard of perspicuity, that their poems require commentators to expound them, and their meaning is lost to the general reader.

'V. The poet must be a perfect master of the language in which he writes; and as he must in no case sacrifice sense to sound, so must he likewise be careful not to violate the rules of syntax or offend against grammatical correctness.

'The great fault of the Jewish poets of Damascus is, that they altogether lose sight of grammar and correctness of expression. Among these Damascene scribblers,

[d] Rabbi Judah ben Salomon, ben Al-Hophni, called Al-Charizi, whose *Tachkemoni*, written in 1210, displays a curious mixture of didactic, satiric, and facetious compositions. Professor Munk on the *Hebrew Poetry of the Middle Ages.*

[e] Al-Charizi, in *Tach-kemoni*, cap. xviii.

there

Digitized by Google

there is one Rabbi Isaac ben Baruch, whose poems are, in a manner, composed of broken, disjointed fragments, and form nothing but patchwork. They are like chaff without corn. His idiom is barbarous, his flow of language resembles bitter waters, his poetic ardour chills the mind of the reader by its icy influence. His heroes are cowards, his men are women, his saints debauchees; every line is faulty. He relied upon the opinion of his flatterers, although they were incapable of judging whether he rejoices or weeps, whether he sings or brays.

'VI. The poet must not submit his labours to the world in a crude and imperfect state, but must previously bestow the greatest attention on revising and correcting what he has written.

'Nothing is more ridiculous than to present the world with the untimely abortions of a hollow brain.

'VII. Nor must he force all that he has written on the attention of his readers.

'He must exercise both taste and judgment in selecting only the best, as fit to meet the public eye; as he cannot expect that all his writings should be equally perfect.

'These seven points are the prime requisites on which the poet must fix his mind. He must remember that he submits his works to all classes of readers; to those unlearned in the poetic art, as well as to qualified connoisseurs. It must, therefore, be his object to satisfy the general reader by the elegance of his language, the learned by the value and importance of the subject on which he writes; and the connoisseur by strict attention to correctness and the rules of art. The poems of Rabbi Salomon ben Gabirol are in part open to censure, because they only satisfy the learned, but leave the mind of the general reader unmoved.'

The fame of Rabbi Abraham ben Meir, Ebn Ezra, best known by his two last names, a native of Toledo, who married the fair daughter of Hallevi, surpassed even that of his highly-gifted father-in-law. He was a perfect master of the Hebrew and Arabic languages, was unfettered by the scholastic trammels of the times; he bowed not to the name of Aristotle, the idol of his brother schoolmen, and advanced beyond them all in a true understanding of the holy Scriptures, of which he is reckoned by the Jews to be the most luminous commentator.

The marriage of Ebn Ezra with the rich and lovely daughter of Jehuda Hallevi was as romantic as a poet could desire. Previous to Hallevi's fatal pilgrimage to Jerusalem, he felt a desire to see his only child, a daughter, beautiful in person, accomplished in mind and manners, then verging upon womanhood, and heiress to his great wealth, given in marriage to a suitable husband. The impatience of his wife to hasten the accomplishment of this object before he departed on his perilous expedition, sometimes urged at unseasonable times and with undue importunities, caused the exasperated Rabbi to make a solemn vow that he would give his daughter in marriage to the first unmarried Israelite

Digitized by Google

Israelite who should present himself to him on the morrow. The next day Ebn Ezra, in his travelling dress, entered the school, and reverentially greeted the Rabbi Jehuda, who was unacquainted with his person, although his fame had reached him.

The hospitable Rabbi, as was his custom, entertained the traveller, and desired him to make his house his home, during his sojourn in Lucena. Jehuda's wife started with surprise when she beheld the homely garb and humble exterior of the young Israelite, but her more discerning lord soon discovered that his young inmate was highly gifted by nature, and was possessed of manly virtues, goodness of heart, and a lively imagination. These qualities won the hearts of both father and daughter; but the pride of the mother was wounded, and she exerted all her conjugal eloquence to induce her husband not to bestow their daughter upon a poor and obscure youth, whose mental and corporeal wants were to be supplied by her husband's charity. All her tears and entreaties could prevail no farther than to obtain a promise that he would superintend the youth's education and not grant him their daughter until he had proved himself worthy of such a treasure.

The young student commenced his studies with the rudiments of the sciences as if he had been a mere tyro, under the zealous care of Rabbi Jehuda, who expressed his satisfaction and astonishment at the rapidity of his progress. The pupil, who had perceived from the first that his presence occasioned some embarrassment in the family, had resolved to conceal his name and acquirements until he should discover the cause.

One evening when Rabbi Jehuda had remained in his study a longer time than usual, and had not taken his seat at the supper-table till after many messages had been sent to him, his pupil ventured respectfully to inquire the reason, but received an evasive but kind answer. The mistress of the mansion went to her husband's study, and returned with an Hebrew poem that he had not finished transcribing, as the concluding lines in the draught did not satisfy him. 'If thou art worthy to be the favourite disciple of Rabbi Jehuda Hallevi,' she said, giving him the manuscript, 'complete what he has begun.' Ebn Ezra took the poem with a smile, perused it, took a pen, made a few corrections, and completed the concluding stanza in so masterly a manner, that the Rabbi had scarcely perused it than he rapturously embraced him, and exclaimed, 'Assuredly thou must be the famous poet, the young Ebn Ezra! and most welcome art thou to be my son-in-law.'

Some years after this happy event Rabbi Ebn Ezra undertook a scientific

Digitized by Google

a scientific tour through Europe. He visited England, France, Germany, Italy, and Greece. In Rome, where he was received with the greatest respect by both Jews and Christians, he prolonged his stay and profited greatly by the rich literary treasures of the Vatican. During his residence in the Eternal City, he wrote, among other works, his celebrated book המאונים (*Hemaonim*), a grammatical work, about the year 1167. During a sojourn in Rhodes, at that time the seat of a celebrated Jewish college, he wrote his commentaries on the book of Daniel. Whilst at Tiberias he held long and frequent conferences with the masoretic doctors on the text of the holy Scriptures. On his return from Palestine he resided several years in Italy, engaged in literary labours. He wrote his commentaries on the Pentateuch at Lucca: but one of his greatest productions הלשון צחות (*eleshun tsechoth*) 'the Beauty of Diction,' which gives the Hebrew student similar aid and instruction that Quintilian does to the Latin, he wrote at Mantua, about the year 1172.

Among the testimonials borne to the writings of this eminent critic, philosopher, and poet, the celebrated Maimonides, of whom the Jews say that 'from Moses (their lawgiver) unto Moses (Maimonides) there arose none like Moses,' [f] recommended the study of Ebn Ezra's writings to his disciples; particularly in a long and affectionate letter of exhortation to his son Rabbi Abraham, acknowledging that he was himself greatly indebted to them for the clear views they had given him of many obscure passages in the sacred Scriptures.

Ebn Ezra continued his travels until a late period of his life, and died at Rhodes, in the seventy-fifth year of his age. His last words prove that his religious feelings and mental tranquillity remained with him till his last moments; for in addressing his friends, he said, in allusion to the departure of the Patriarch Abraham from Haran, [g] 'And Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of *this world of wrath*,' playing upon the word חרן *Haran*, which, by the addition of one letter, he altered into חרון *haraun*, 'wrath.'

His writings are very numerous, but many of them are still only in manuscript. A learned writer in an Anglo-Hebraic [h] periodical enumerates twenty-eight distinct works by this author: among which are his beautiful lines on the game of chess, which have been often translated, and are universally known and admired.

---

[f] ממשה ועד משה לא קם כמשה. [g] Gen. xii. 4.

[h] בכורי העתים (*Bekúri Heothim*) for the year 5586 (A.D. 1826), pp. 53 and 54, and for 1827.

There

Digitized by Google

There are too many Hebrew poets of the middle ages, whose names are held in honour among the Jews, to be even named in the narrow limits set to this disquisition. Yet, although their great Maimonides did not produce any great poetical works, he was so mixed with all the literature, both Hebrew and Arabian, that a few lines must be devoted to him.

Notwithstanding the clouds which so often obscured the horizon of the Israelites in this interesting period of their history, they did not forget the words of the wisest of their sages, that[l] 'there is a time to weep and a time to laugh; a time to mourn and a time to dance;' for at intervals the melancholy and generally grave Rabbis cast off the garments of mourning, and in festive robes sang lays of love and entwined their epigrammatic sayings with jocose playing upon words; and, at times, they even ventured on *facetiæ*, which, says Professor Munk, the reader is astonished to meet with in the sacred tongue.

One[k] of the leaders of the armies of the Sultan Noureddin, became acquainted with Maimonides in Africa, where he sought shelter from his persecutors in Spain. He took him into his service, nominally as his physician, but really as his confidential friend and adviser. He was subsequently elevated to the same distinction in the service of Saladin.

His greatest work מורה הנבוכים (*Moreh Han-nebuchim*) 'the teacher of the perplexed,' or 'the guide to the erring,' was written in Arabic under the name of *Delalath Haizim*, between the years 1185 and 1194, which he translated into Hebrew for the use of his countrymen. This eminent critic, philosopher, commentator, and linguist, died in 1204 or 1205, universally lamented as one of the greatest men of the Hebrew nation.

The fierce controversy that arose about this period between the French Talmudists who contemned all profane knowledge, and the philosophical Jews of the Arabian and Spanish schools, furnishes another[m] instance of the fondness for playing on words that characterized the Jews of this period. One of the disputants on the sacred side, Rabbi David Kimchi, had written a mild expostulatory epistle to Rabbi Jehuda Al-Phacar, one of the leaders of the philosophical sect; he replied to the mild rebukes of Rabbi David in a harsh and insulting manner. The remonstrant having begun his missive with[n]—'Behold I stand forth as the antagonist (in Hebrew שטן, *satan*) of the promoters of disturbance and disunion,' Rabbi Jehuda pounced like an angry lion upon the equivocal word *Satan*, turned it against the

[l] Eccles. iii. 4. [k] Fadl Abd-Errahim ben Al-Baisam.
[m] See the last words of Rabbi Ebn Ezra, p. 387.
[n] Ep. II., R. David ad R. Judam.

mild

Digitized by Google

mild Rabbi David, replying,[o] 'The Lord rebuke thee, Satan!' and that[p] 'David was the youngest' of his opponents; two quotations from Holy Writ, but which in Hebrew form the following rhyming couplet:—

ינער יהיה בך השטן
דויד הוא הקטן
'Enoer Jehovah bek he-Satan
David heva ha-ketan!

If the Greeks boast of their Homer who sang of the wrath of man, the Romans of their Virgil, who celebrates a haughty demon's unrelenting hate, the Hebrews boast no less of their psalmists and other sweet singers of Sion, who struck their harps and sang praises to the tender mercies and love of the Almighty Creator towards his creatures—a God who hates nothing that he has made. This is the greatest pride and honour of their nation; but they boast also of one of more modern times, the middle ages, who, from the circumstance of having taken the same subject, גן עדן (*Gan Eden*) *Paradise* for his poem, has been called *the*[q] '*Hebrew Dante.*'

Professor Lozati, of Mantua, the author of the article whence this account is taken, says that accident placed in his possession several ancient Hebrew manuscripts, collected at Leghorn. Among them he found, to his great surprise, an epic poem, called ספר תהיכל (*Sepher Tehikel*), 'The Book of the Temple,' by Rabbi Moses di Rieti. On perusing it Professor Lozati was astonished to find the work replete with poetic beauty and merit. The more he read, the more was he struck with the resemblance between this poem and the *Divina Commedia;* not only with respect to the purity and elegance of the language and the depth of thought and strength of expression, but also with the subject, which is identically the same as the *Paradiso* of Dante. Rieti's style is like that of the father of Italian poetry, is often obscure, so much so at times as to convey to the mind a meaning beyond that which meets the eye.

The poem is divided into eight books, which together contain one thousand and twelve stanzas of ten hexameter lines in each. The author has added notes illustrative of his subject, which contains much curious and valuable information respecting the numerous sages and great men whom he celebrates. Unlike the great Florentine, who confines himself to the great men of his own generation, he sings of departed saints and sages, of the

[o] Zechariah iii. 2. [p] 1 Sam. xvi. 14.
[q] See the בכורי העתים (*Bekúri Heothim*) for the year 5589 (A.D. 1829), p. 14.

souls

Digitized by Google

souls of good and virtuous men, who in their blissful abodes pass before him and acquaint him with their deeds, their sufferings, and their rewards.

Signor Lozati has fixed the period when this little-known poet flourished, for in one of his notes, he says—'Rabbi Moses Maimonides was the father of Rabbi Abraham, whose son was Rabbi Obadiah, the father of Rabbi David, whose two sons were made captives and reduced to slavery: this happened in our youth.' From this observation, Professor Lozati arrives at the period when di Rieti lived. For Rabbi Abraham, he says, held the office of his father the great Maimonides about the year of the world 4970 (A.D. 1210), and, from the ordinary course of events, he assumes that Rabbi Obadiah was born before the year 5000 (A.D. 1240), and that the sons of Rabbi David were carried into captivity about the year 5100 (A.D. 1340), and concludes, from other similar calculations, that 'The Temple' of Rieti was written about 5160 (A.D. 1400).[r]

Lozati was very anxious to know whether any of the Jewish critics or historians mention this author, but found him noticed only by Rabbi Gedaliah ben Joseph Jachija, author of the שלשלת הקבלה (*Shelesheleth He-cabala*), 'The Chain of Tradition.' This historian says that 'Rabbi Moses di Rieti wrote a poem on the history of tradition; but as he did not pay due attention to chronological order, I have been able to avail myself of his assistance to a very limited degree.' Lozati concludes his very interesting paper on this curious literary discovery by saying, 'This is all I can find recorded of this illustrious poet, and I therefore feel happy and grateful that it has pleased Providence to afford me the means of making known to my brethren, the house of Israel, that the first poet who emulated Dante in the glorious career he had opened was a Jew, and that, as our language is rich in precious works on every science and branch of knowledge, it has likewise produced an epic poem worthy to rank among the most distinguished of any age or country.'

Professor Lozati has done his brethren great and good service by his announcement; let him also do the world another and a great act by giving a copy and a version of a portion, if not of the whole poem, which would be an addition to general public literature. A few stanzas of the original Hebrew hexameters would aid in dispelling the mystery of Hebrew rhythm and metre, which has so long perplexed the learned world.

In the preceding pages[s] honourable mention has been made of

[r] Dante was born at Florence, A.D. 1265, and died at Ravenna in 1321.

[s] Pp. 380, 381.

the

Digitized by Google

the Hebrew poet Salomon ben Gabirol, not only as a teacher, but as a master in lyric poetry. His untimely death was briefly mentioned in page 381. He was slain by an Arabian, or, according to some historians, a Jewish merchant, who, jealous of his great talents and reputation and the fortune that awaited him, murdered him in his thirtieth year, and buried his body in his (the assassin's) garden. The discovery of the murder and the murderer plainly shows the retributive justice of Providence. It is said that close to the spot where the body of the murdered poet had been buried there stood a young date-tree, which suddenly and before the usual age began to bear fruit. This rare precocity attracted the attention of the Arabs, and the owner of the garden was summoned to appear before the emir to explain the cause. Alarmed and confused, the murderer admitted the fact that it was caused by the burial and decomposition of a human body, which was disinterred and found to be that of Rabbi ben Gabirol. He then confessed his crime, and was hanged upon the very tree that had caused his detection.

The style of his poetry has been already shown.[t] The following prose version of an elegy, written in mournful remembrance of the destruction of Jerusalem, is a good specimen of the more solemn style. It is, as well as that mentioned in page 377, received by all Israelite communities as one of the elegies to be chanted on the 9th day of Ab, the anniversary of four [u] great and terrific national calamities.

The poet selects for his text or motto the 16th verse of the 1st chapter of the Lamentations of Jeremiah:—

'For these things I weep; mine eye, mine eye runneth down with water.

'Alas! these sacred ruins are the result of our sins, which we expiate this day with floods of tears; and every year I give vent to my grief by mournful lamentations.

'My heart is broken; for me no comfort lives.

'Where are there sufferings equal to mine! O listen to the dreadful tale of two scions of the stock of Aaron, whose memory consumes my bosom like a devouring fire; and every year I give vent to my grief by mournful lamentations.

'Two lords among the strangers had carried away as captives the son and daughter of Ismael the High Priest. One of the nobles said to the other, "Among the captives of Sion, I have chosen a maiden clad in purple, bright as the moon and fair as Kezia and Jemima."[x] "And I," replied the other, "have arrived from the conquest of Jerusalem, where I won a bright-eyed slave, shining like the sun in the middle of the horizon. Let us join the handsome couple; they will give us

[t] P. 381. [u] *Vide anteà*, p. 381. [x] Daughters of Job. children

Digitized by Google

children whose brilliancy will excel the brightness of the stars." Still these words ring in my ears. O see my affliction, see my torn vestments; for ever I give vent to my grief by mournful lamentations.

'Both the lords consented, and shut up their captives at night in the nuptial chamber. The virtuous pair felt the agony of fear. O night of woe, when the hymeneal torch was quenched in tears.

'And the betrothed youth sighed, "Shall a descendant of Aaron embrace a slave?" and the daughter of Jochabee, desolate in grief, exclaimed, "Shall I clasp a bondsman to my breast? If the Lord of heaven has pronounced this decree, then stay, ye spheres, your celestial chords, and join, with voices of terror, in the cry of my despair."

'The dawn of morning found them thus apart. They glanced at each other, recognised their well-known kindred features, and flew into each other's arms. "It is thou, my brother!" "I have thee, my sister!" Their voices choked, their hearts beat, their souls intermingled, and they flew together into the regions of bliss.

'In a vision of the night, the former of the two appeared to Jeremiah, and then the spirit of holiness spoke through the prophet: for them I weep! And every year Israel gives vent to her pain by mournful lamentations.'

Among the distinguished Hebrew poets of this age, whose names have been already mentioned, none rank higher in every department of literature than Rabbi Isaac ben Jacob Alphes. He was born at Kalah Haman, in the kingdom of Fez. On occasion of some disputes with his brethren, he left his native country about the year 1089, and accompanied Joseph ben Taschfin, king of Morocco, on his expedition into Spain. He resided some time in Seville, subsequently in Cordova, and finally settled at Lucena, and became chief rabbi of the Jewish community in Seville. Under his guidance and that of his immediate predecessors, Rabbies Isaac ben Geath and Isaac ben Alkalia, whose great learning and lamented death are mentioned before,[y] the school at Lucena became famed, and held a distinguished rank among the Jewish seats of learning of that day.

In addition to his acknowledged eminence in Biblical and rabbinical literature, being at the head of the Talmudical school, he was well versed in that of Greece and in other branches of profane learning. He surpassed all his contemporaries in fame as well as influence, and died, universally respected and regretted, at the advanced age of fourscore years and ten, at Lucena, where he was buried.

He is the author of a great work known and celebrated under the name of Al-Phesi, or Mahariph, a word compounded from the initials of his name; which contains a compendium and illustration of the Talmud.

The following translation of the inscription on his monument,

[y] P. 383.

Digitized by Google which

which is still preserved, shows the high estimation in which he was held, and will also afford a curious specimen of the style of that period :[z]—

'WRITE with a pen of steel on a diamond tablet—
'To perpetuate the memory of our loss,
That the remotest generations may mourn,
And all our descendants weep for him.
Tell them, the Fountain of Wisdom lieth here
Buried and concealed. Man gropes about in darkness.

COME, ye daughters of Sion, weep and mourn,
Mourn for him, with bitter lamentations:
For this tomb is the cause of your grief.
Here lieth the Ark of the covenant, broken,
And the tables of testimony shattered into fragments!

'Here lieth enshrined, the chief of chiefs, the prince of saints, the teacher of the wise; the divine philosopher and sage, Rabbi ben Jacob Al-phes,' etc.

The custom of celebrating the praises of heroes, by females, among the ancient Hebrews, is indicated in Scripture in the triumph of the women, led by Miriam, with 'timbrels and with dances,'[a] over the destruction of the Egyptians; and by the women coming forth with music and triumphal songs, to meet the conquerors of the Philistines. That the care to delight the ear with music was entrusted chiefly to women, is clear from the little mention made in holy writ of such an occupation by men, except the priests and Levites in the service of the Temple. This custom has been observed by Jews in all ages, and is, according to Niebuhr,[b] still a prevailing custom of the East.

The actions of the heroine of Bethulia and her triumphant songs, accompanied by her female companions in the lofty chorus, were favourite subjects with the bards of Judea from the author of the book of Judith in the Apocrypha, to the poets of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

The following poem is of that period, but the name of the author does not appear in the version whence this is taken.

JUDITH, the daughter of Merari, the rich and virtuous widow of Manasses, both of the royal tribe of Judah, had mourned her husband's death for three years and four months, when her beloved country was threatened with all the horrors of war, from the invasion of Judea, by an enormous and victorious army under the command of Holofernes, satrap of Assur the Assyrian monarch.

The proceedings of the senate and people of Jerusalem, and the wise and prudent conduct of this heroic woman, who delivered her

[z] About A.D. 1140. [a] Exodus xv. 20.
[b] See his *Reisebeschreibung v. Arabien und andern umliegenden Landen.*

Digitized by Google

country

country from the power of the enemy, are animatingly related in the Apocryphal book that bears her name.

JUDITH, fair as she was virtuous, and brave as she was devoted to her country and her faith, is recorded among the deliverers of her people.

When the elders of the city were about to surrender their hard-pressed citadel to the enemy, the widow of their departed friend Manasses presented herself before them, and asked what advantage it would be to throw open their gates to the enemy? 'Put a steady trust in the Lord,' said the courageous heroine; 'I meditate a deed of which after-ages shall speak!'

She accomplished her object by means more to be admired than commended, being partly by treachery; but the danger was eminent, the enemy cruel and implacable, and the attempt beyond comprehension, but the success ennobled the deed.

At her appointed signal, on the morning of her fifth day's absence from the city, at early dawn, the Hebrews made a sally from the city, raised the war-cry, and the alarmed Assyrians flew to arms; when the dauntless Judith held up on high the head of the lifeless chieftain. A deadly panic seized the Assyrian host, which immediately took to flight, and Judah was saved.

Before the heroine resumed her widow's garb, which she had put off only to effect the liberation of her country, she counselled her people to arm themselves and complete the victory she had so signally begun. After pursuing the discomfited Assyrians, and spoiling their wealthy camp, the returning victors were met without the walls of Jerusalem by Joachim, the high-priest, and the elders of the people, who blessed Judith for her courage, which had delivered them from their powerful and vindictive enemy.

The women also ran to see their deliverer, and blessed her, and crowned her and her maid with garlands of olives. The daughters of Judah returned to the city led by Judith and followed by the soldiers and the people with triumphant dances and songs of rejoicing: Judith and her companions singing and joining in the lofty chorus.

The following is a prose version of the poem founded on these circumstances:—

JUDITH'S ODE, *or Song of Praise for Deliverance from the Assyrian Armies.*

'JUDITH.

'Begin unto my God with timbrels,
Sing unto our Lord with cymbals;
Sing unto him a new song, exalt him
And call upon his name.

'He

Digitized by Google

'He breaketh up the battle: in the camp and in the midst of the people he hath delivered me from the hands of those who persecuted me.

'From the north came the mighty Assur, with the thousands of his host; where their multitudes drank, the waters ceased to flow; where their warriors trod, the harvest failed upon the hills.

'He boasted that he would burn my native land, that he would slay our young men with the sword, would crush our new-born children under the hoof: our youths they would destroy, and take our tender virgins as a spoil.

'But the Almighty Lord frowned, and their hopes were destroyed.

'Who overthrew the mighty captain of the Assyrians? For the mighty one fell not by the hand of our warriors, who, with youthful ardour, buckle on their swords; nor by our skilful veterans of the lance and shield; nor did giants fall upon him.

'CHORUS *of Israelitish Women.*

'Behold! it was Judith the daughter of Merari, who put off her garments of widowhood to deliver Israel.

'She poured perfumes on her brow, she bound her hair in lovely tresses, and decorated herself with her choicest raiment.

'And she prevailed mightily, the falchion passed through his brawny neck.

'The Persians trembled at her courage, and the Medes were confounded by her hardiness.

'JUDITH.

'Then did my afflicted people shout for joy, and my weak ones cried aloud.

'SEMICHORUS.

'The Assyrians were astonished; they lifted up their voices, but they were overthrown.

'JUDITH.

'I will sing unto the Lord a song of praise.

'Let all creatures serve thee, O Lord my God! for thou spakest and they were made, and none can resist thy voice.

'The mountains shall be moved from their foundations, the rocks shall melt at thy presence: yet thou art merciful to them that fear thee.

'All sacrifice is too small for thee, and all our burnt offerings insufficient; but he that feareth the Lord, he shall always be great.

'FULL CHORUS OF ISRAELITES.

'Woe to the nations that rise up against us; the Lord God omnipotent will take vengeance of them in the day of judgment, in putting fire and swords into their flesh, and they shall feel them, and weep for ever.'

Digitized by Google

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

'Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all; why are they then baptized for the dead?'—1 Cor. xv. 29.

THERE is perhaps no passage of the same character in the word of God which is involved in greater obscurity, or which has given rise to more speculation than this passage. There are portions which refer to subjects beyond the grasp of human intellect, and when men attempt to fathom these and to be wise above what is written, error and diversity of opinion, so far from being matter of surprise, are to be expected; other parts are variously interpreted according to the different views of professed Christians, and what they conceive to be the analogy of faith; but the subject of this passage is not of either of these classes, but seems at the first view to be some solemn usage connected with baptism in the times of the Apostles, and which one further explanation in the Scriptures or in the practice or history of the early Church might place beyond reasonable controversy. Men may dispute the position that those who succeeded to the office and lived in the times immediately subsequent to the age of the Apostles were most likely to be imbued with Apostolical doctrine, or even call in question their testimony as to what doctrines prevailed in the Church at large in their own times; but in matters of mere outward usage or custom, which are more strictly and purely matters of fact and subjects of historical narrative, it requires a reckless boldness inconsistent with the spirit of sober inquiry after truth to repudiate the evidence of uncorrupted antiquity.

No trace, however, of any peculiarity in the administration of baptism in any special cases, or at any particular times, or under any circumstances of more than ordinary danger, corresponding with the language of the Apostle and his supposed allusion to such cases, is to be found either in the sacred writings or in the pages of antiquity and the practice of the early Church Catholic.

Such being the case, the suspicion that no such peculiarity connected with baptism ever existed naturally suggests itself, and we are led to inquire whether some other interpretation may not be given of the Apostle's language harmonizing equally well with the tenor of the argument in which this expression is found, and with his meaning and phraseology in analogous passages.

But

Digitized by Google

But before proceeding to a statement of what the writer believes to be the sense of the words in question, he will examine the various interpretations which he has been able to consult, and to show why they seem unsatisfactory.

By some it has been conjectured that reference is here made to the practice of some of the early heretics who, when any died unbaptized, baptized others in their stead; but such a supposition scarcely deserves a serious confutation: for, independent of the doubt that may be justly entertained of the existence of such heretics at so early a period, and the fact that the heresy of the Marcionites to whom this practice is attributed took its rise long after the epistle to the Corinthians was penned, can we imagine that St. Paul, in contending for and endeavouring to build up in the most important article of their most holy faith, even the key-stone of their hopes, those whom he addressed, would adduce as an argument the erroneous practice of those who had corrupted that faith? If, in the passage in question, he refers to any practice connected with baptism, we must conclude that, in adducing it to give force to an argument, he refers to a practice orthodox and not heretical; for the mere mention of any practice in the Christian Church by a sacred writer without censure expressed or implied, much more its being adduced as an argument upon a subject of the highest importance, and not only as an argument, but as the climax of a train of reasoning, gives it the stamp of Apostolical sanction.

Beza believes it to refer to the Jewish washings of the dead, but this position cannot be maintained without violence to the natural construction and signification of the language made use of, and besides this, the same objection which exists against the preceding is applicable in a minor degree to this conjecture. If St. Paul had been reasoning with Jews, and proving that the resurrection of the dead had been held by the patriarchs and other worthies of the Jewish dispensation—or if these words had occurred in his Epistle to the Hebrews—we might then have suspected that the practice referred to was a Jewish one, and a practice which would have had no significancy or force unless they had believed the resurrection from the dead. But the Apostle is here speaking not to Jews but to converted heathens, not to the Hebrews but to the Corinthians, upon whom any allusion to a Jewish practice perhaps little known to them would have been thrown away; and he is not endeavouring to prove that the resurrection of the dead was held under the Old Testament dispensation, but to vindicate the doctrine itself against those who denied it *in toto*, or maintained that it was past: it is therefore reasonable to conclude that the Apostle, if referring to any

 usage,

Digitized by Google

usage, is reasoning from the practice not of Jews but of Christians.

Another interpretation which has been suggested is that the Apostle refers to the case of those who presented themselves for baptism immediately after the martyrdom of their brethren or at their funerals, as if fresh soldiers should enlist and press forward to the assault to supply the places of those who had fallen in battle, and in support of this a solitary passage from Dionysius Halicarnasseus has been quoted:—'These, as soon as they entered upon their office, thought proper to enrol other soldiers in the room of those who were killed in the Antian war, *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀποθανόντων.*' But it is evident that the Apostle's argument is not directed to the motives of the persons in question; and although the supplying the place of those who had fallen in battle is a very consistent motive in those who were as rulers specially interested in the welfare and safety of a state, yet we cannot suppose that this was the principal or prominent motive for entering the army in those who were thus enrolled; and unless we suppose that the persons who were thus baptized were baptized to supply the place of those who were actively engaged in attacking everything that exalted itself against Christ, and in extending his kingdom, the analogy is feeble; while it is likely that those who embraced the Gospel lost no time in receiving the initiatory rite, for in every instance recorded in Scripture we find this to have been the case. Indeed, although the supplying the place of those who had fallen may be regarded as a motive, yet it is in a very qualified sense, for the motives which influenced men to become the disciples of Christ were the fear of wrath which led them to flee to the hope set before them, the desire of heaven, the expectation of a future resurrection, and the love of Christ; and their entering the ranks, and thus supplying the place of the martyrs, was itself an effect of these feelings and not a motive.

The opinion that the expression 'for the dead' means for Christ, one who is dead, is certainly more in accordance with the train of reasoning pursued by the Apostle; for if there were no resurrection of the dead, what motive could Christians have in being baptized for and owning as their Lord one who was dead, and who therefore could not profit them in the present, their only state of existence? But although this interpretation harmonizes with the general drift of the argument, there are various and strong reasons for rejecting it.

In the first place, the expression baptized for Christ in this sense is very harsh and it is without parallel; Christians are said to be baptized *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* 'into the name' of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Matt. xxviii. 19; *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, 'into

Digitized by Google

'into the name' of the Lord Jesus, Acts viii. 16, xix. 5; εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, 'into Christ Jesus,' Rom. vi. 3; εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, 'into his death,' Rom. vi. 3; εἰς ἓν σῶμα, 1 Cor. xii. 13; εἰς Χριστὸν, Gal. iii. 27, into Christ; ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, in the name, Acts ii. 38; and ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, Acts x. 48; but in no case do we find the preposition ὑπέρ thus used. Christians are baptized into Christ, initiated into his Church, and enrolled among his disciples by baptism, but are never said to be baptized for Christ but for the remission of sins, Acts ii. 38 compared with xxii. 16.

Again, the noun 'dead' is in the plural number νεκρῶν, and all the ingenuity used to prove that this plural is elsewhere used to signify only one, is fruitless. It is said that when Christ raised the widow's son he told the disciples of John to tell him that the dead, plural νεκροί, are raised; but the case is not applicable. It would not be at all at variance with popular and familiar phraseology to say of a person who had raised a dead or opened the eyes of a blind man, he raises the dead or gives sight to the blind; but it would be very different to assert that a person who was baptized into the name and doctrines of a particular individual was baptized and initiated into the dead at large, because that individual was dead. Moreover, although the raising of the widow's son is the only instance related in close connection with our Saviour's words to the disciples of John, yet we know that our Saviour not only raised up others from the dead, but gave his disciples power to do so also (Matt. x. 8); and have therefore no right to conclude, that, in saying νεκροί, our Saviour had only that case in view, but may believe that he combined with it other instances either prospective or retrospective—a view supported by the verb used, 'are raised,' implying not past and perfected, but continued or customary action; and if so, this passage gives no support to the opinion in favour of which it is brought forward.

The expression in 1 Cor. xv. 12 is equally inapplicable, if there be no resurrection of the dead, νεκρῶν, *i. e.* 'of one single person' (Whitby). Now we know that generals include particulars, and that in saying all men die, we assert practically that every man dies: but it is evident that the Apostle is reasoning from the general resurrection to a particular case, and the interpreting or paraphrasing his words to suit this theory, would render his reasoning very puerile and inconclusive. It would make him say that because there was no resurrection of one person, therefore there could not be of another, which is absurd; or that because no *single* person, *i. e.* without a *single exception*, rises, therefore Christ does not rise—a truth which certainly required no proof by argument or from apostolical authority. It is certain that the

Digitized by Google

words 'having raised him from the dead' (plural) νεκρῶν, Acts xvii. 30-31, give no support to this theory, for the having raised him from the dead cannot mean having raised him from himself, but ἐκ, out from among the dead, and is exactly parallel with his having become the first fruits *of them that slept.* The resurrection of the dead which Paul preached to the Athenians, it is urged, must have been the resurrection of Jesus alone; but this is assumed, for wherever Christ and his resurrection were preached it was always in connection with the hope that they who believe in Him should be also raised up at the last day, and partake of his glory. Now although the resurrection of the dead, Acts xvii. 32, follows immediately the declaration of Paul that God had raised up Christ from the dead, yet it is evident that Paul was interrupted when on the point of entering upon a subject which he had already set before them, and that therefore these words are equally applicable and as much connected with that declaration of Jesus AND *the* resurrection general, not his resurrection, which led them to say that he seemed to be a setter forth not of a strange God but of strange Gods.

Having thus examined the various interpretations of the passage which seem to claim consideration, and shown why they appear unsatisfactory, the writer will now proceed to the examination of the passage itself.

It is evident from a perusal of the whole chapter in which these words are found, that the utmost force of the Apostle's train of reasoning, the height of the *climax* of his address, is contained in them, and that immediately upon answering in the 32nd verse the question proposed in the 29th, he considers himself as having placed the subject in the strongest possible light, and therefore proceeds without further delay to answer the objections to the doctrine of the resurrection from its apparent difficulty, directing those who staggered through unbelief or weakness of faith, to the power of God, as exemplified daily and under their own observation in what was equally difficult and closely analogous, the germination, perishing, and reproduction of vegetable bodies.

Premising, then, that these words contain a more forcible statement of the unprofitableness of the Apostle's life and labours, and the emptiness of the faith and vanity of the hopes of those among whom they laboured, if there was no resurrection; and that upon this supposition the conduct of those who were thus baptized could not be accounted for upon any rational principles—the present writer would observe that such a statement must consist either in some peculiarity in the character of the baptism itself, or in the object for which it was received, or in both; and being thus led from the structure of the address to expect this, let us proceed to

Digitized by Google

to seek for such a peculiarity as would attach to the language of the Apostle the emphasis evidently intended.

That his kingdom was not of this world is a truth which we find our Saviour constantly inculcating on his disciples. So far from leading to any earthly advantage, he assured them that the preaching of his Gospel would expose them to scorn and bitter persecution. 'Behold,' he says, 'I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves. They will deliver you up to the councils and scourge you in their synagogues, and ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake.' At the same time he supported and encouraged them by revealing that kingdom which hath no end, and declaring that 'there was no man that had left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for his sake and the Gospel, but he should receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands with persecutions, and in the world to come eternal life.' He consoled them under the prospect of death with assurances of a resurrection to eternal life so clear that nothing but the mist of their carnal prejudices could have prevented them from discerning their import: 'He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it' Notwithstanding these declarations we find that they were slow of heart to perceive the spiritual nature of his kingdom, and ever disposed to think that he would at that time restore the kingdom of an earthly sway to Israel. Upon one occasion we find this exemplified in a very striking manner in the case of the sons of Zebedee, who at the suggestion of their mother, desired to secure the principal places of honour in their Master's kingdom, and this too immediately consequent upon his declaration of the sufferings he was about to undergo. In answer to this application our Saviour puts a question calculated to undeceive them in itself, and to show that such an eminence as they desired would be an eminence in sufferings and in labours. 'And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying: Master, we would that thou shouldst do for us whatsoever we shall desire. And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you? They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit one on thy right hand and the other on thy left hand in thy glory. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask; Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and *be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?* And they say unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the *baptism* that *I* am *baptized* withal *shall ye be baptized.* But to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared.

Digitized by Google

prepared. And when the ten heard it they began to be much displeased with James and John. But Jesus called them to him and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you; but whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister. And whosoever will be the chiefest shall be the servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and *to give his life* a ransom for many.' The history of the Apostles confirms our Saviour's declaration. Those who had called the Master Beelzebub did not scruple to vilify his faithful servants; and they who had scourged and crucified the Lord of glory did not hesitate to scourge and put to a cruel death those who by their preaching reminded them of their exceeding wickedness and sin in refusing that Just One. And while the enmity of an evil world arrayed itself against the followers of Christ generally, they were in a peculiar manner baptized with the baptism with which their Lord was baptized who preached in his name. Stephen was stoned, calling upon God—Herod killed James with the sword—John was banished—and Peter was only delivered from sharing the fate of James by a miraculous interposition, to suffer at a future period.

But if we desire to feel the full force of our Saviour's declaration, let us contemplate the course of him who, although he declared himself the least of the Apostles, and not meet to be called an Apostle, yet laboured and ministered to the family of God more abundantly than they all, 'in labours more abundant, *in stripes above measure*, in prisons more frequent, *in deaths oft*.' Of the Jews he says, 'five times received I forty stripes save one, thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep, in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.' And let us direct our attention to his description of the life, labours, and sufferings of the ambassadors of Christ as exemplified in his own experience; though 'giving no offence in anything that the ministry be not blamed, but in all things approving themselves as the ministers of God,' yet ever 'in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings;' although they approved themselves 'by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned,

Digitized by Google

feigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left,' yet compelled to pursue their way 'by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report,' to be counted as deceivers, and to be ever exposed to death and chastening, so that he is brought to the conclusion, 'That God hath *set forth us the Apostles* last as it were appointed *to death*, for we are made a *spectacle unto the world and to angels and to men.* Even unto this present hour we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place, and labour, working with our own hands; being reviled we bless, being persecuted we suffer it, being defamed we intreat: we are made as the filth of the earth, and are the offscouring of all things unto this day.'

Under these circumstances, then, would it be at all surprising if one who had drunk so fully of the spirit of his Divine Master and been so deeply baptized into that baptism with which our Saviour was baptized (Mark x; Luke xii.), and of which he declared that his Apostles should also be partakers, should make use, in reference to his own sufferings and those of his fellow-labourers in the Gospel, of a phraseology to which our Saviour's previous application of it had given so powerful a significancy, and speak of them and himself as baptized with the baptism with which Christ was baptized—the baptism of suffering and death?

That this is the baptism here referred to, seems, however, capable of almost conclusive proof, from a critical examination of two words associated with it, the force of which seems to the present writer to be at the least very much weakened in their translation in the 29th verse, and in the following one to be entirely lost. The words referred to are τί καί, an examination of the use of which will, it is apprehended, be found to prove that in this position the καί is expressive of continuance, and that associated with a verb of action, these words in this order demand a reason for the continuance of such action. In the following instance this is unquestionably the case, 'For we are saved by hope, but hope that is seen is not hope, for what a man seeth, why doth he yet [or still] hope for,' τί καὶ ἐλπίζει (Rom. viii. 24)? In accordance therefore with the use of these words in this relative position, the Apostle's question would perhaps be more correctly translated, 'Why are they yet or still (not then) baptized for the dead, *i. e.*, Why do they continue to be baptized for the dead? Why do we still stand, or continue to stand, in jeopardy every hour?'

It may be said, indeed, that this repetition of an interrogative without a connective particle is abrupt, but this is rather an argument in favour of this rendering, as it is in accordance with the whole passage, which is extremely abrupt in its transitions; while the

Digitized by Google

the translating καί in one place *then*, and in another *and*, when in both cases it is found in exactly the same connection, seems to be more objectionable than an appearance of abruptness, particularly in the writings of St. Paul. But if it is admitted that these words imply a continuous action, it is clear that no baptism can be regarded as continuous but that of suffering.

It may be said, indeed, that it may refer to other and fresh persons coming forward to receive the rite, but this is scarcely admissible, for we cannot suppose, without violence to the natural connection, that the 'they' in the first clause applies to one set of persons, and the 'we' in the last to another; while the connection of the τί καί in the succeeding verse, in which it clearly signifies the continued action of one person, reflects on the preceding one a confirmation of this interpretation.

In becoming disciples of Christ we must admit that all Christians exposed themselves more or less to peril, but in mere submission to the *rite* of baptism there was nothing particularly difficult to flesh and blood, neither pain nor imminent danger, which would give force to the interrogatory, Why are they then baptized for the dead? But here we have a baptism whose essential principle was suffering and its consummation death, for the reception of which, therefore, nothing short of a future resurrection could be considered a sufficient motive to a rational being, and the enduring which could not possibly be accounted for without such a motive.

Hence we invariably find the Apostle supporting his soul when submerged under the deep waters of this baptism, with this hope: 'For as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ. For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came to us in Asia, that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired *even of life*: But we had the *sentence of death* in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which *raiseth the dead*' (2 Cor. i. 5). Again, 'We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in dispair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; *Always bearing* about in the *body the dying of the Lord Jesus*, that *the life also of Jesus* might be made manifest *in our body*. For we which live are alway *delivered unto death* for Jesus' sake, that *the life also of Jesus* might be made manifest *in our mortal flesh*. For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day' (2 Cor. iv. 8, *et seq.*). Again, 'But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord:

Digitized by Google

Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ. That I may know him, and the *power of his resurrection*, and the *fellowship of his sufferings*, being made *conformable unto his death;* If by any means I might attain unto the *resurrection of the dead*' (Phil. iii. 8, 10, 11). Again, 'Whereunto I am appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles. For the which cause I also *suffer these things:* nevertheless I am not ashamed: for I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that *he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day*' (2 Tim. i. 11, 12, and ii. 10, 11). 'Therefore I endure all things,' for, 'It is a faithful saying, If we be *dead with him, we shall also live with him.*'

We find the Apostle, indeed, referring to other sources of consolation, and though sorrowful through outward sufferings and dangers, yet always rejoicing in the testimony of a good conscience, in the consolations that he found in Christ's presence with him, and in the progress of his converts; for 'now,' he says, 'we live if ye stand fast in the Lord,' but of this heavenly arch of comfort the resurrection of the dead was the keystone; remove this, and the whole fabric crumbled into dust; and if in this life only he had hope, he was of all men most miserable. Hence, although we find him frequently referring to other sources of comfort, it is ever in beautiful connection, expressed or implied, with this; and in his deepest afflictions—those deaths in which he was oft, we always find this the prominent, if not sole refuge in Christ of his soul, deprived of which he stood defenceless and naked indeed (2 Cor. v. 3).

From this consideration of the Apostle's sufferings, and the hope, which, as an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast, kept his soul not only immoveable but always abounding in the work of the Lord, let us turn our attention to the nature of this labour, and the object in pursuit of which he exposed himself cheerfully and constantly to the baptism of suffering and death.

'If any man,' said our Saviour, 'will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me.' He himself grew up as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground. To the natural man he exhibited no comeliness, and to the wise and ambitious of this world no beauty, that they should desire him. Hence those who rejected his preaching and that of his servants, and thus perished, rejected the Gospel because to them it appeared as foolishness, proposing to the carnal man no suitable object, and exhibiting to the Greeks none of that wisdom which they sought, nor to the Jews that display and direction of Almighty power which had of old discomfited their enemies, and the manifestation of

Digitized by Google

of which, directed to the same objects, or to give them the nations under their feet, they again expected in more than former glory.

The Gospel, on the contrary, called on men not only to deny their most powerful appetites, to overcome the whole body of sin, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life: a struggle so painful as to be compared to cutting off a right hand and plucking out a right eye; not only to wrestle against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. This was the warfare to which they were called, and this the subjugation in accomplishing which they were to expect the exhibition of the stretched out arm of Divine interposition; the subjugation not only of their grossly evil propensities, but of every degree of excessive attachment to the things of this life: bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ, compared to whose love and service they were to count all that men value in this life but as dross, and for whose sake they were to be ready to lay down life itself if called upon so to do.

The preaching of the Apostles harmonizes with that of their Divine Master. They declare that 'the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world.' They exhort them not only to mortify their members which are upon the earth, but not to 'love the world nor the things of the world;' and they compare their detachment not only from sin and self-righteousness, but also from the relation in which they stood to the world and to the views they entertained of the value of earthly things previous to their conversion, to *death* itself. They urge them to count themselves *dead to sin*, Col. iii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 24; iv. 1; *dead to the law* as a plea for righteousness, Gal. ii. 19; *dead to the world*, Col. iii. 3. And not only so, but they address them as *dead*,—'For *ye are dead*, and your life is hid with Christ in God.' They are said to have crucified the flesh; to be *buried* with Christ; to have put off the body of sin,—all expressions of equal force with death itself. The wise, he who thought himself such, is to look upon himself as a fool; the self-righteous as the chief of sinners; the rich and ambitious to rejoice that he is made low; and all to reckon as loss those things which they once counted gain, having now found a more enduring treasure.

To lead men thus to act, no less powerful a motive than the one set before them could have been sufficient. If they were to forbear from laying up treasure upon earth, it was that they might lay up treasure in heaven. If the body was dead because of sin, the spirit was life because of righteousness. If they were willing to

Digitized by Google

to leave father and mother, and brethren, and sisters, and houses, and lands, it was because they hoped to receive an hundredfold, even eternal life. If they were were willing to live as strangers and pilgrims, it was because they were citizens of a heavenly country. If they were *crucified, dead,* and *buried* with Christ, it was that they might be *raised* and *be alive* unto God. Hence in the Apostle's preaching we find the resurrection constantly associated with this death of self as the only sufficient supporting motive. '*Therefore* we are *buried* with him by baptism into *death;* that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the *likeness of his death,* we shall be also in the *likeness of his resurrection.* Knowing this, that our old man is *crucified* with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin; for he that *is dead* is freed from sin. Now if we *be dead* with him, we believe that we shall also *live* with him' (Rom. vi. 4-8). Did they count all things but loss? it was that they might know the *power of his resurrection,* if by any means they might attain unto the *resurrection of the dead* (Phil. iii. 10). Was their conversation in heaven? it was because they thence looked for the coming of the Saviour, who should *change their vile body,* that it might be fashioned like unto his glorious body (Phil. iii. 20, 21). Did they *endure all things?* it was because they knew it was a faithful saying, If we be *dead* with him we shall also *live* with him (2 Tim. ii. 10, 12). Were they *begotten again unto a lively hope?* it was by the *resurrection of Jesus Christ* from the dead.

Such being the object of the Apostle's preaching, to lead men to consider themselves dead with Christ, and the motive adduced, being that they might live with him, and realize his faithfulness to his promise, 'because I live ye shall live also,' would not his introducing the object or the effect of his preaching have given increased force to the repetition, in stronger phraseology, of the declaration, 'Then is our preaching vain, and your faith also vain?' and might he not well ask in astonishment, If there is no resurrection, why should I make the least sacrifice or exertion? not to speak of sufferings unparalleled in any mere man, to lead men to deny themselves, to count themselves dead to the enjoyment of the present, their only state of existence, and to make them unnecessarily miserable. He may farther be considered as referring to the convictions and the faith by which they had been led to become dead, and with a view of strengthening these principles, by recalling them to their remembrance in all the freshness and vigour of their early and cheering influence, an object which he seems to have in view in the 11th verse, when he says, 'whether it were I or they,

Digitized by Google

so we preached and *so ye believed*;' asking how they could have been induced to forego what they had foregone, and to act as they had acted if there was not resurrection. But if we consider the expression ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν as combining a reference both to the object of his ministry, intimated by the preposition ὑπέρ, its success in their having become really dead signified by νεκρῶν, and to the motives by which they had been influenced, alluded to in the question, we must admit that it is peculiarly appropriate; and if we connect with this the degree of suffering which he endured to accomplish this object, expressed in that baptism which our Saviour had associated with the cup which he prayed might pass from him, it seems that human language could scarcely place the subject in a stronger light, and that the expression, 'baptized for the dead,' contains a depth and compass of meaning and a strength of argument seldom equalled by St. Paul himself.

That this is the import of these words appears not only from their constant use in the sense contended for in other parts of the word of God, and particularly by St. Paul, and from the appropriateness of this interpretation to the train of reasoning pursued, but also from the conclusion to which he comes, as natural and consistent if there was no resurrection (ver. 32)—'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Now, the force of this answer evidently lies in its opposition to the course of conduct pursued by those baptized, the Apostles alone, or those for whom they were thus baptized, or by both: but mere submission to the rite of baptism, under any circumstances, is not in itself an opposite to eating and drinking, suffering and privation, 'weariness and painfulness,' 'hunger and thirst, fastings often, cold and nakedness,' and deadness to the world certainly are.

The conclusion to which the successful worldling came, when he had much goods laid up for many years, was, 'Soul, take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry.' He was alive to this world, but dead to a better; and if there had been no better, he would have acted wisely, and as St. Paul himself would have done, and advised others to do, if there was no resurrection.

The opinion here maintained derives further confirmation from the preposition employed (ὑπέρ) and the connection in which we find it elsewhere: 'Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations (my baptism of suffering) for you (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), which is your glory.' Ephes. iii. 13. 'And whether we be afflicted, it is for (ὑπέρ) your consolation.' But the following passage is still more closely analogous: 'Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ for (ὑπέρ) his body's sake.'

In all these quotations we find the Apostle representing himself

Digitized by Google

self as enduring these sufferings for the sake of those to whom he preached, and expressing the connection which those sufferings had with their welfare and his consequent joy, in nearly the same terms and by the use of the very preposition which connects the baptism here spoken of with those for whose sake it was submitted to, an argument in itself of some force in fixing the meaning of the words thus connected by it; especially when we find connected with them the same joy and the expression, 'Why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I die daily—νή—Yes, for your rejoicing, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord;' for the words 'I protest' are an addition to the text, or, at least, disturb the juxtaposition of the words in the original: but this is a circumstance which calls for more than a passing remark.

Our Saviour's injunction, Swear not at all, is familiar to every reader of his word. Now, although we know that an oath for confirmation is the end of all strife, and find St. Paul, on more than one occasion, calling God to witness the truth and sincerity of what he affirmed, yet we cannot suppose that he would protest or swear BY the rejoicing of the Corinthians. The word thus rendered is νή, an adverb, which, if not another form of the word ναί, which our Saviour used when he said, 'Let your communication be yea, yea, ναὶ ναί,' is of much the same use and import. The opposition of the Apostle's practice in swearing BY *anything* but the Deity, and that to attest something of which there could be no doubt, (for certainly his sufferings and perils were too evident and notorious to require attestation,) renders the judiciousness of this translation suspicious; and an examination of the manner in which the synonyme ναί is used, gives abundant foundation for another interpretation, and for the conclusion that νή is similarly employed in the passage under consideration. According to Hoogeveen, they both are particles of affirmation, confirmation, and assent; νή being at the same time juratory. But this is not always the case. Thus, in Lucian's dialogue between Pan and Mercury, Pan says, χαῖρε ὦ πάτερ Ἑρμῆ, and Mercury answers νὴ καὶ σύ. See also another instance in Seager's Note on 'Vigerus,' and in Lucian's 'Timon' (Walker's edition, p. 98 seq.). In addition to what is observed in the authorities above-mentioned, an examination, limited, indeed, but of several passages, in which ναί, and this one in which νή occurs, seems to attach to them the character of resumptive particles, if such an expression may be allowed, and that they are peculiarly appropriate where there has been an approach to parenthesis, and where the principal subject is resumed with greater intensity of feeling, or more decided and energetic assertion. Thus, in Luke xi. 50, where many words intervene between ἐκζητηθῇ, 'may be required,' and the

Digitized by Google

the persons of whom it shall be required: the former being in the beginning of ver. 50, and the latter 'this generation' in the end of ver. 51, we find ναί used as a connective, and at the same time intensive, particle, partaking in its use of the nature of a conjunction as well as an adverb. In Luke xii. 5 the reason for fearing only God is introduced, and the injunction which preceded this is then repeated with ναί before it. But the principal passage on which we would ground the translation of νή by yea or verily is, the twentieth verse of the Epistle to Philemon, because also penned by St. Paul, and because every individual has, more or less, an idiom of his own and a peculiarity in the use of certain words. In the seventeenth verse, he says, 'If thou count me therefore a partner, receive him as myself;' and after interposing a promise to pay any debt which Philemon considered due from Onesimus, he resumes his entreaty: Yea, ναί, brother, let me have joy of you in the Lord; an expression which has, in common with that to the Corinthians, a reference to spiritual joy, and one which seems to be very analogous.

For these reasons I would rather translate the passage thus: Why stand we in jeopardy every hour? (for) I die daily, yea, or yes, verily, for the sake of your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus. And if the conjecture that νή, an adverb followed by an accusative case, is at all times an elliptical form of expression, is inadmissible, it may be at least supposed that it is so in the present instance; that the accusative is governed by διά understood, and that the expression and its construction may be classed with διὰ τοῦτο, on this account (see instances in Vigerus on διά); the only difference being that while νή and ναί both possess a connective power, the former is also intensive in a strong degree; and in support of this interpretation a few passages closely analogous may be adduced.

In addressing the Thessalonians St. Paul says, that he had sent Timothy unto them to establish them, and to exhort them not to be moved by his afflictions, because he was appointed thereto by Him who causeth all things to work together for good: and he farther consoles them under their grief at his affliction with the assurance that the good tidings of their faith which Timothy had brought were to him an abundant source of comfort. 'Therefore,' he says, or on this account, διὰ τοῦτο, viz., the good tidings of your faith, 'we were comforted over you in all our afflictions by your faith. For what thanks can we render to God for you for all the joy wherewith we joy for your sakes, δι' ὑμᾶς, before God.' The following passage is, however, still more to the point, and when it is compared with that under consideration, and it is remembered that both were uttered by the same person, the

Digitized by Google

they must be considered as conveying the same sentiment. Addressing the Philippians, he says, 'Yea, and if I be *offered* upon the *sacrifice* and service of your faith, I *joy* and *rejoice* with you all.' In both of these passages we find, first, a reference to his sufferings; secondly, the mention that he endures them for the sake of his converts; and thirdly, the joy which he had in the midst of them on account of them and their faith; but in the latter we have the willingness to be baptized with the baptism of death mentioned in his Epistle to the Corinthians, in a closely similar expression, I am willing to be poured forth or offered up; the object in the one case being, the rejoicing which he had over them, —that is, their faith; in the other, the sacrifice and service of their faith—the joy itself in the one being, '*I* joy and rejoice *with you* all;' in the other, '*Your* rejoicing, *which I* have.' This coincidence in phraseology and sentiment appears to give some ground for the translation, Why stand we in jeopardy every hour; verily, for the sake of your rejoicing which I have, etc.; and it removes the inconsistency of St. Paul's swearing or protesting; [for there seems no difference if it is BY anything] in a manner inconsistent with the simplicity of language enjoined by our Lord.

The structure of the whole chapter, indeed, and of the train of reasoning tends to establish this view of the subject. In it we find the force of the Apostle's argument resting not upon a single, but a two-fold support: the impossibility of accounting for his conduct, in the first place, in preaching; and for theirs, in the second, in receiving the gospel yoke; and the folly of both, if there was no resurrection. He begins with declaring unto them the Gospel, which, he says, *I preached* unto you, and which also *ye have received;* and in the eleventh verse, therefore, whether it were I or they, so we preached and so ye believed. In the 14th, If Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. And again, in the 17th, If Christ be not raised your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. And in the 19th, If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men most miserable.

Here we find all along an argument supported on the right hand and on the left; but if in the question which he puts in the 28th verse he adduces any peculiarity in the circumstances of only one party, namely, those who are baptized, even if we should admit that this was a third party not hitherto mentioned, and occupying a position in the Church which exposed them to equal or greater hazard than what St. Paul and the other Apostles underwent in preaching the Gospel; still the force of his reasoning is very much impaired by the absence of the argument, from the conduct of the many, which was included in all his previous statements;

Digitized by Google

ments; nor can it be thought that so eminent a master of the powers of persuasion would have summed up an argument so forcibly stated,—showing how impossible it was to suppose that not only he, as an individual, or the Apostles, as a small band, would have undertaken at the peril of constant death to preach the Gospel, but that they should also have found such numbers, and the Corinthians among them, so infatuated as to submit to its humbling and self-denying demands, if it had not been from a firm belief of the resurrection of the dead,—that he would have summed up this powerful statement by adducing the conduct of merely a few individuals in the Church so obscure that their memorial has completely perished with them.

It is, however, difficult to imagine that the Apostle should, without any explanation, have introduced a third party not hitherto mentioned, and impossible to think that there were any persons whose position in the Church exposed them to equal, not to say greater peril than the Apostles themselves, a circumstance necessary to give propriety to the introduction of the words in this sense as the climax of a train of reasoning, and this itself is sufficient to induce us to examine whether the expression made use of might not be applied to those who, we know, occupied the most dangerous position, even those who were sent forth as sheep in the midst of wolves, and who in every storm were as a city set on a hill that could not be hid, and even if it had not been so applied elsewhere to appropriate it to them; but when we find the very same expression applied to them by our Saviour himself, and the sense in terms synonymous by the Apostles themselves, there can scarcely remain a doubt that they are the persons spoken of.

There is, however, another reason for believing this to be the case, namely, their being introduced by St. Paul in a previous part of the chapter. For he says, 'I am the least of the Apostles that am not meet to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than *they* all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me. Therefore whether it were I or *they*, so WE (THE APOSTLES) preached, and so ye believed.' And from this point he associates them with himself as preaching the Gospel: 'Yea, and we the Apostles are found false witnesses,' until he comes to the 29th and 30th verses, where we again find 'they' and 'we' in the same relative position which 'I' and 'they' occupied in the 11th verse, no third party to whom they could apply having been in the mean time introduced. Is it not natural then to think, were there no other reasons for doing so, that these words refer to the same persons as in the 11th verse; the 'they' to

Digitized by Google

to the Apostles at large, the 'we' to St. Paul himself, who was eminent in his zeal, danger, and suffering, and better known to the Corinthians?

The following may be considered a free translation of the whole passage, according to the view here taken of it, which regards the ambiguity of the figurative expression, 'baptized for the dead,' as explained and intended by the apostle to be explained by its reiteration, in the more literal terms that immediately follow it. 'Else what shall they do who are baptized with the baptism of suffering, for persons, whose great and distinguishing principle is deadness to the world, if the dead rise not, and there is no resurrection state? Why do they continue, as we apostles have done up to this present hour, to be baptized with such sufferings, for such an object, namely, to inculcate renunciation of and deadness to the world; and why continue we to stand in jeopardy without ceasing, or every hour? for, for the sake of my rejoicing over your evident possession of, and profiting in, this principle, that I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I myself, as one of the apostles, am a standing proof of the manifold and deep afflictions and dangers which we encounter; for they are so great that I may say I die daily or am daily baptized with the baptism of suffering and death..... Whereas if the dead rise not, it would be much wiser for *us* to avoid these dangers, and both for us and you to be alive to the world, to live while we live, to eat, drink, and be merry, seeing that to-morrow we die.'

If the apostles had endured the baptism of suffering for the sake of men, who were alive to their worldly interests, and if their teaching had been such as to foster a worldly disposition, or if they had given indications of wavering, their conduct might have been accounted for without reference to the resurrection and a future world; and there might have been room for a shade of suspicion of their acting from motives of final interest on this side the grave; but the braving sufferings and death for such a length of time, for the sake of persons who were dead to the world, and upon whom they urged self-denial and a willingness to die in the path of duty, would have been utterly inexplicable, except by their trust of a future resurrection.

To conclude, the absence of any Scriptural or historical, or even traditional evidence in support of any other view, the variety of opinions entertained upon the subject, all of them the fruits of pure conjecture, and most of them doing violence to the natural construction, and all of them, with but one exception, which is heretical, harsh, and far-fetched, and deriving no support whatever from the Scriptures or from antiquity—these circumstances are in themselves proofs that these opinions are unsatisfactory, and

Digitized by Google

arguments against their correctness; while the interpretation here proposed is not only in perfect accordance with the word of God at large, with the language and sentiments of St. Paul himself in other parts of his Epistles, with the train of reasoning pursued in the chapter in which these words are found, and with the sense of the words elsewhere separately and connectively; but all the arguments adduced in its support have been drawn from these sources, than which none can be more legitimate or better entitled to deference; each of them possesses in itself some strength, and, combined, they appear to prove that the Apostles are the persons here spoken of as baptized—that the baptism referred to is that which our Saviour announced as their portion (Mark x.; Luke xii.), and that by the dead are meant the people of God, the body of Christians in the Apostolic times who were led by the Apostles to consider themselves dead,[a] and to lead them to do which they endured that afflictive baptism—and finally, that these words in this sense are well adapted to sum up a powerful appeal like that of the Apostle, as describing in the conduct both of those who preached and those who received the Gospel, if there was no resurrection, a depth of infatuation and an extent of folly perfectly unaccountable. 'Their life,' in this case, 'would have been madness,' indeed, 'and their end without honour.' (Wisdom of Solomon.)

R. K.

---

[a] Of the appropriation of a similar term to designate an individual we have an instance in the use of the expression 'he that cometh,' as signifying our Saviour.

Digitized by Google FIRST

FIRST LESSONS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

No. I.—Preliminary Remarks.

Complaints have occasionally been made against the 'Journal of Sacred Literature,' on the ground that it is too exclusively devoted to the benefit of those who have made considerable advance in Biblical studies, and that it does not enough consult the wishes or provide for the wants either of general readers or of young students—those who are setting out in the course of Biblical investigation—on both which classes it must of necessity be to a considerable extent dependent for support. Perhaps there may be some justice in these complaints. At least they have led the Editor to promise that for the future there shall be "a larger proportion of matter suited to *all* readers who take interest in Biblical investigation, without compromising the character for sound scholarship which the publication has already won." It has occurred to the writer of the present article that the Editor's promise will be to some extent redeemed by a series of papers on the very elements of Biblical criticism, such as may be fitly designated 'First Lessons.' In these papers it will be the object of the writer to treat the subject in such a way as shall be intelligible, and, if possible, interesting to general readers; and for this end he will demand no more special or technical acquaintance with the subjects discussed than every person of ordinarily good education may be fairly presumed to have. This, it is the writer's belief, may be done without any sacrifice of correctness for the sake of intelligibility. The design is to exhibit in plain English, with as little *display* of learning as possible, the principles that must guide the Biblical student in his critical investigations, to describe the course of this investigation, and to point out the results to which it leads. Such First Lessons, it is conceived, may not only be acceptable to the general reader, but may also be advantageous to the young student, by preparing the way for better understanding more elaborate treatises. As the range of subjects thus marked out are technically designated by the term 'Introduction,' so these papers may be considered as forming an introduction to the science, if it may so be called, of 'Introduction.' That term is employed to designate such investigations as are needful in order to introduce, or lead in, the student to such a position as that he may be prepared satisfactorily to investigate the sacred writings themselves. These papers may lead him into such a position as to prepare him to enter on the more systematic study of the subjects they refer to, if he desires it, or may give him some intelligible notions if he is satisfied with a bare outline.

Digitized by Google

Instead of this technical term, 'Introduction,' we have used the term Biblical Criticism, as being much more intelligible and sufficiently expressive of the subjects which we design to treat of, without, however, intending to limit ourselves merely to what might be included in that term in its more exact use. Our object is to treat of all those inquiries that may be called subjects of previous investigation in regard to the Books of Scripture—that is, of all that is to be inquired into respecting the Bible previously (in logical order, at least) to our going to it for ourselves as the fountain of life for our own souls. It will be observed that we do not include in the subjects of investigation the proper evidence of Revealed Religion. That is a question separate from the criticism of its records. We take for granted that there is evidence of Christianity, as a religion, being divine; and, starting from this point, we proceed to the investigation of the documents which profess to give an account of it. It may be remarked here, however, that our investigations have an important bearing upon the proper evidences of Christianity, and the results to which we arrive may fitly be made use of in reference to the evidences. If, for instance, we found that the records were confused and contradictory, though this would not necessarily invalidate the truth of the Christian doctrine, it would greatly alter the relation in which the Bible stands to that doctrine; and if, on the other hand, we found in the records proofs of divine superintendence and arrangement, we should properly bring this result in as an evidence of the Christian Religion. This distinction it is ever important to keep in mind. Forgetfulness, or a willing oversight of it, has furnished scepticism with some of its most effective means of attack. Supposed inconsistencies in the *record* have been brought forward as disproving the doctrine of Christianity. Let it be understood that we do not allege that there are such inconsistencies, but only that, *if there were*, all that they would prove is, that our view of the relation in which the record stands to the doctrine must be modified. An illustration will perhaps serve not only to make this clear, but also to mark out more clearly the limits of our subject.

Suppose there had come down to us from distant ages and from various quarters accounts in writing of some medicine—some *elixir vitæ*—which, when used according to the directions given, would prevent or cure all diseases to which the human frame is liable, and would thus lengthen out the life of man, and continue that life in health, until old age gradually coming on, he who followed the directions given sunk down into a quiet and peaceful grave, dying, as we say, of 'old age.' We should all be anxious to know what this medicine really is, and how it is to be received. But

Digitized by Google

But the documents containing the account of it are in foreign tongues—they can be read only by the learned—they do not all contain the same precise information respecting the elixir; but some speak of it more obscurely, and some more plainly. They have been transmitted with care, yet still there are a variety of differences in the written accounts, which profess to give the very same treatise on it. From the fame of the medicine imitations have sprung up, and false accounts have been transmitted to us along with the true. It is clear that we need caution and care in receiving the accounts that are offered us. We must not be over credulous, or we shall be cheated into receiving some spurious compound instead of the true specific. We must not be over sceptical, or we may miss the advantage altogether. What, then, should be our course? Plainly this. In the first place, we ought to inquire into the truth of the alleged virtue of the medicine. If we are convinced on good evidence that it is altogether a mere piece of quackery, there is an end of the matter: we concern ourselves no more about it. But unless we are so *convinced*, prudence dictates at least further inquiry. We have, then, to examine the records which profess to give an account of the remedy. Now, in doing this, how are we to proceed? Our first inquiry must be, are these records, or any of them, *genuine?*—that is, do they come from those from whom they profess to come? Then, are they *authentic?*—that is, do they contain a true account of what they profess to give an account of? And when we have proceeded thus far, and have found that some of these accounts are both genuine and authentic, setting the others completely aside (except so far as they may serve to illustrate those we have selected), we proceed to a more careful examination of these. They will form our *canonical* accounts. But we must not stop here. For, first, we have to settle what is the *true text* of the documents; then we must determine how their meaning is to be ascertained; then to compare the views given by one with those given by another, that we may have an accurate knowledge of the whole subject. But it is clear that the greater number of those who might be benefited by the medicine cannot undertake all this labour and research. Are they, then, to be left to any empiric who professes to have the true elixir, and to make no inquiry for themselves? Certainly not. The wise and reasonable course is for them to follow the guidance of those who are in a condition to investigate these matters—to ascertain the results to which they come—and, if they believe their guides to be honest and competent, they will feel that it is not yielding themselves to be blindfolded and led they know not whither if they take the path such guides point out. When, however, different guides present themselves,

Digitized by Google

themselves, all affirming that they know the right way; and when, moreover, there are not wanting those who tell them to trust to none of these, for all are alike deceivers; it becomes them to adopt such means as they can to ascertain the trustworthiness of those who offer to conduct them. How can this be done better than by being informed of the principles on which these guides have come to the conclusions which they present to them? For most men who have any curiosity about the matter will feel that if they have not the time or attainments to follow the detail of the various arguments, they are quite competent to determine the validity of the principles on which the arguments are conducted. Some, too, and perhaps not a few, will think that if they had a simple account given to them of these matters, so that they might really see what they are apt to lose sight of amidst the multiplicity of detail involved in arguments and counter arguments on minute points, they might be able hereafter to make some progress for themselves in the investigation of matters which now seem to be quite beyond their reach. We see, then, that our subject embraces the following points:—Genuineness, Authenticity, and Canonical Authority of the Books; Determination of the Text; Principles of Interpretation of the Text. Our illustration, however, fails in one important particular. We have not supposed that the knowledge of the medicine was communicated by God—that it was a Revelation. But in the case before us, if the Bible be at all what it professes to be, we must regard it as containing a message from God to man. It has been revealed, and those who revealed it must have received it from God—that is, they were inspired. The last and highest point, then, to which we come is Inspiration. We place this last, because it is clear that we must be first acquainted with the mode in which the message is conveyed before we can gain any correct notion of the mode or degree of inspiration of those who conveyed it.

We shall not now enter upon the discussion of any one of the subjects which we have thus marked out. The present paper is meant to be wholly introductory, and we shall close it by a few general observations. And in the first place, it will be easily seen that there is an analogy between the first three and the last three of the topics into which we have divided our subject: that the former relate to the Scriptures considered in the mass, and looked at as it were from a distance; the latter are analogous questions which come to be considered when we view them close at hand and look upon their internal structure. The subjects, as we have stated them, are the genuineness, authenticity, and canonical authority of the *Books;* the integrity, significance, and inspiration of their *Contents.* Thus the topics before us may be regarded as forming

Digitized by Google

forming three pairs: first, the genuineness of the book and the purity of the text, or, is it the work of the author to whom it is assigned, and what precisely did he write; secondly, the authenticity of the book, and the interpretation of the text, or, is the book trustworthy, and what did the writer mean; and, thirdly, the canonical authority of the book and the inspiration of its contents, or, is the book part of the canon of Scripture, and what is its authority as such. To take a particular example by way of illustration, we have to inquire whether the Acts of the Apostles, for instance, was written by the author from whom it professes to come, viz., Luke, whether it is a real and not a fictitious narrative, and whether it is received by Christians in general as canonical; then, further, we have to inquire how we are to ascertain what Luke really did write, how we are to come at the meaning of what he wrote, and to what extent, or in what degree, his narrative is to be held as authoritative in the highest sense, that is, inspired. To impress this view on our readers, we will put side by side the three pairs of subjects:—

Books of Scripture.	*Contents of the Books.*
Genuineness of the Book.	Integrity of the Text.
Authenticity of the Book.	Meaning of the Text.
Canonicity of the Book.	Inspiration of the Contents.

We are the more particular in insisting on this analogy between the two sets of subjects before us, because, for reasons to which we will immediately refer, we shall not discuss them in the order in which they are here placed, and which certainly has a claim to be regarded as the natural order.

To justify our departure from this order we remark, secondly, that we are not in the position of those who come to the examination of these documents for the first time. We have a certain number of them selected from amongst the rest, and therefore having a *primâ facie* claim to our first attention, because they are already received as canonical. It will greatly facilitate our labour to investigate, in the first place, the claims to canonical authority which are put forth on behalf of certain collections of documents, some more and others less extensive. We shall thus rid ourselves of the encumbrance of many, undoubtedly, spurious documents, which we need concern ourselves no more about. Taking this line of investigation, it must be remembered that we shall not have proved the genuineness and authenticity of any of these documents when we have determined them to be canonical. We shall merely have selected them from amongst the mass of professed documents as those which deserve further inquiry. But it is to be remembered, on the other hand, that their reception into the canon must have proceeded from their supposed genuineness and authenticity, since no book, wanting these qualities, can by any be deemed canonical.

Digitized by Google

canonical. And we have, therefore, in determining the canon as a whole, gone some way towards proving the genuineness and authenticity of the books which we find are regarded as canonical.

Thirdly, it is quite possible that some who read thus far (certainly it must be those who are quite unversed in Biblical criticism), may be ready to say, You are putting before us as questions to be discussed, matters about which there ought to be no dispute. We are willing to receive first lessons in Biblical criticism, but surely we are not to make it a matter of question what *is* the Bible. Such an objection must be made very inconsiderately, yet it may be not the less sincerely. And we must profess that we unfeignedly sympathise with that strong attachment to the Bible as the life-giving Word, which leads to the objection, if indeed it be made, by those who really know and have experienced the saving power of its truths. But the objection may be made also by those whose professed reverence for the Bible is only reverence for human authority after all, who receive the Bible merely because it has been handed down to them, and whose belief in it as the message from God to man has no firmer and no surer foundation than their belief in the Koran would have had, if their lot had been cast in a land where the writings of the false prophet are the accredited message from God to man. To this latter class of objectors we would say, Read on, we beseech you; for though we are but looking at the Word from a distance, and though we do not profess to lead you into the heights and depths of its spiritual truth, yet it may do you some good to know that there are those who believe this Word to be more than the outward, formal, humanly-attested thing which you suppose it. Your faith is a faith in man merely. It stops there. It goes not forward from man to rest in God. And the sooner you are rid of it the better, if only you are led to see that this record is no human device, but is, in truth, 'the record which GOD gave of his Son.' With regard to the former class of objectors, we cannot better express our feelings than in the words of their and our Lord and Master, 'O ye of little faith, wherefore did ye doubt?' To them we would appeal. You know that in this Word there is a Divine power. Why should you fear critical investigation? The answer would probably be, that it is not fair critical investigation that is feared, but such disbelieving, not to say irreverent and licentious, criticism, as they have heard is rife in Germany, and as they hear rumours of even in this country. If the objection take this form we would answer, All that you urge is true. There is, indeed, much licentious criticism abroad, and much more than many a simple-minded and earnest Christian, who has come by a shorter and a surer road to the invincible conviction of the truth of the Christian records, would believe. But so far from this being an argument against critical

Digitized by Google

critical investigation, it is the strongest argument that could be used to show its necessity. Criticism, both German and English, not only has investigated, but will investigate, the whole and every part of the professed revelation from God. Every point is now being tried and tested anew. Subtle objections have been and continue to be brought forward. How are they to be met if those who value most the Bible refuse to look at them? How is their evil influence to be overcome, if those who ought to be able to give a reason for the hope that is in them, refuse to acquaint themselves with the historical grounds on which the credibility of the Scriptures in which they believe rests, and the objections that are made to these? It is indeed for this very reason that we have been induced to take up the present subject, believing it to be not uncalled for. We fully accord with the conviction expressed by Dr. Davidson, in his valuable 'Introduction to the New Testament,' vol. i. p. vi.: 'It is the writer's belief that the books of the New Testament are destined ere long to pass through a severe ordeal.' And on this account we look upon our present attempt as not unimportant. Every intelligent Christian ought to know something of the general principles and leading results of criticism as applied to that book which is the foundation of his hope. Let us, however, take this occasion to state explicitly our firm conviction that no adverse criticism, however acute and far-seeing, can ever invalidate the Christian Scriptures taken as a whole, and especially and most emphatically (whatever of mere expression and outward circumstance it may remove or modify) never can it affect the substance of the Gospel—that Gospel which, as we believe, rests not on the word of man, but on 'the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.'

It may very probably be said, that such a declaration at the outset prejudges the whole question. If any one reads this who has betaken himself to Biblical criticism, in order there to find weapons which he may use against the Bible, we can imagine the supercilious air with which he will say, What one-sided criticism is this! Let such a one reflect, however, that there is at least candour in the acknowledgment; and let him remember, moreover, that being impartial is not the same thing as being indifferent, much less is it the same as being adverse. We are as anxious, not to receive, as the truth of God, that which has no title to such an origin as the veriest sceptic that ever rejected the Bible. And further than this, we prefer a claim (not of course for ourselves personally, but for intelligent Christians, who discern in the Bible spiritual truth in general) to a degree of impartiality in such investigations, higher than can be claimed by either the sceptic on the one hand, or the formal Christian on the other. The one investigates,

Digitized by Google

vestigates, hoping to find that the evidence is inconclusive, the other continually fearing the removal of the smallest particle of testimony on which he has been accustomed to rely, lest his whole superstructure should fall to pieces. But the Christian, who has found for himself that the words which Christ has spoken are spirit and are life, can afford to be impartial, nay, he has every inducement to be so, both because his faith does not, and also in order that it 'should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.'

POPULAR BIBLICAL LECTURES.

The Bible Self-Evidential. A Lecture by the Rev. HUGH STOWELL, A.M. London: Nisbet and Co. 1850.

The Bible: its Provision and Adaptation for the Moral Necessities of Fallen Man. A Lecture by the Rev. HUGH M'NEILE, D.D. London: Nisbet and Co. 1850.

The Literary Attractions of the Bible. A Lecture by the Rev. JAMES HAMILTON, F.L.S. London: Nisbet and Co. 1850.

A MOVEMENT is taking place at the present day which may possibly attract little notice, but is not on that account of less importance. Organised efforts are being made to promote the intellectual advancement, combined with the moral and spiritual improvement of our young men. It would be going over old ground to enlarge on the importance of giving a proper bias to the mind of a generation at that particular age when the trammels of school are taken off and the responsibilities of life have scarcely begun. He who governs others must control himself; and the boy who is under tutors and governors is in like manner sheltered from many temptations. But there are critical years intervening before the boy becomes the father of a family, or the master of the establishment, and this is the time when right influence is most needed, though most difficult to exercise. The difficulty has been acknowledged on all hands. It has supplied many a 'plot' for the drama, and many a subject for the pulpit. Parents have been broken-hearted, masters ruined, legislators perplexed, and ministers of religion in despair from this very cause, that they have not known how to weave the cords that should hold in check the tumultuous passions of young men. Parents, masters, legislators, and spiritual advisers have too many powerful antagonists, and, in some instances, the antagonism arises

Digitized by Google

arises from themselves. The son too often is permitted to discover that his father had run through the same career of folly, and that the *morale* is the same which still animates both, though in the latter it exhibits itself under decent restraints. Masters often find themselves defrauded by those in their employ; they discover that the till is drawn upon to meet the periodical demands of the betting-office, or that forged cheques are presented at the bank to pay the expense of nightly revels. But have the masters no cause for self-accusation? Is every house of business a school of morality, of truth, of fidelity? Are the young men taught no tricks of trade? Do the goods in the window always tell the same tale as those which are supplied to the customer? Is the system of advertising, of puffing, of offering cheap bargains, of 'selling twenty-five per cent. lower than the trade' consistent with honour to the public, kindness to the operative, and moral training of the salesman? We do not undertake to answer these questions. We leave them to those who understand the subject better. The more glaring sources of demoralization in this great metropolis need not be enumerated. Pictures might be drawn of 'London at Night' far less pleasing than the one at the Colosseum. The young men engaged in shops and offices are its more prominent inhabitants; their 'day' begins at nine o'clock post meridiem; and, as 'night's noon' approaches, the excitements provided for them multiply in number and variety.

It is upwards of twenty years since Mechanics' Institutes were devised to check in some measure these pernicious influences by affording opportunities for mental improvement. Reading-rooms, scientific lectures, mutual instruction classes, debating societies, were heard of in all directions. A small expenditure per quarter enables a young man to remedy the defects of his early education, and receive instruction in modern or ancient languages, music and drawing, or the less pretending branches of reading, writing, and arithmetic. The precise results of these institutions are not easily estimated. In theory, they are calculated to raise a barrier against the vicious influence of London nightly amusements. There can be no doubt that the pursuit of literature and science is a grand preventive of intemperance and debauchery. But Mechanics' Institutes have by no means accomplished all that was hoped for; their supporters lament that the mass even of the intelligent labouring population is not reached by them. A statistical writer calculates that 'not less than 231,000 youths in London alone are more or less influenced for good or for evil by the system of late hours of business.' But how many of these are enrolled in literary institutions? Another writer, who wishes to defend

Digitized by Google

defend these societies to the utmost, supposes not more than 60,000 persons of various ages to be attached to 278 institutions, scattered through the whole of England. In the face, however, of these statistics a question arises in the mind, Are these 60,000 really kept from objectionable places of resort by these institutions? We fear not. We question their intellectual results; we have still greater doubt of their moral benefit. These societies professedly exclude religion on the ground of avoiding the prejudices of many of their members. And we do not object to societies because they are solely literary and scientific. Many Christian men are active members of our great scientific associations, and esteem F.R.S. or F.L.S. after their names no inconsiderable distinction. But we think that while religion is not permitted to elevate the tone of these Mechanics' Institutes, and is characterized by their supporters as so much sectarianism, frivolity is admitted and mere amusement, which ultimately renders the cultivation of the intellect distasteful. Their committees have again and again lamented the extreme difficulty of sustaining their numbers at a successful average. Members drop off, and new ones do not come; and finances droop, and the landlord is urgent for the rent. The lectures are consequently made more attractive. We frequently meet with the announcement of a series of highly intellectual subjects for a term's lectures. We extract the following: 'Wit and Humour,' 'The Genius and Writings of Dickens,' 'The Comic Characters of Shakspeare,' 'Irish Bulls,' music in all its shapes, and perhaps conjuring, ventriloquism, and mimicry. The musical lecture is, of course, only a concert under another name; and the lecture on the drama will be eminently suggestive of Drury Lane, if not the Royal Surrey. But on this point we will quote a Mr. William Purdy, the author of a prize essay, entitled 'Knowledge among the Middle and Working Classes.' His sentiments, it may be premised, have the imprimatur of the first and most flourishing institution in London, the Aldersgate-street Literary and Scientific Institution. He says:—

'"A religion giving dark views of God, and infusing superstitious fear of innocent enjoyment, instead of aiding sober habits, will, by making men abject and sad, impair their moral force and prepare them for intemperance as a refuge from depression or despair."* But those who coincide with these views may ask, What amusements are the institutions to select? Which are they to approve, and which condemn? The object, however, is not to select one or two sources of recreation, but to make amusements generally adapted to the real purpose of improvement; to *introduce good music* to the tastes of the multitude;

* Dr. Channing.

to

Digitized by Google

to *have dancing* free from ostentatious parade and immorality; to *establish games without vice seductive enough to supersede the present gambling-table;* to hold soirées for intellectual and social refinement; and, as far as possible, to encourage athletic exercises that will strengthen the limbs and sinews of the thousands employed in sedentary occupations. This would do something *to regenerate society*, and remove the reproach that England is "the wisest, the greatest, but the saddest nation in the world." The institution, fully to accomplish this object, must not neglect making the amusements frequent and economical; for experience has proved that *these are the elements of success.*'

And we subjoin, that if only by such elements success can be obtained, it is not worth the purchase. Those who have sought to regenerate the world by the mere cultivation of the intellect, have found it necessary to mingle with it the cultivation of tastes of a less ennobling character, and have in the end congratulated themselves if only by their instrumentality the world has been *amused.* We are reminded of the juvenile would-be blacksmith, who boasted that he could forge a horseshoe, and, failing to produce even a nail, gloried as he thrust the hot iron into water that he could make a fizz.

We have much pleasure in turning to the Society to whom the lectures at the head of this article have been delivered. It styles itself a 'Christian Association for promoting the Improvement of the Spiritual Condition of Young Men;' and its foremost rule explains that this object is to be effected by 'the efforts of the members in the sphere of their daily calling, by devotional meetings, Biblical instruction, and mutual improvement classes, the delivery of lectures, the diffusion of Christian literature, or any other means in accordance with the Scriptures.' It would further appear from the rules, that, before any new member is enrolled, his religious principles are investigated, his character sifted, and every precaution taken to ensure his suitability. We cannot but think that the 'regeneration of society' will be more surely effected by means like these than those recommended by Mr. William Purdy. Such an association spreads its influences secretly, yet progressively. The means employed are not of human devising, the end proposed is the right one, and the success hoped for is most likely to be vouchsafed. The society is yet in its infancy. It first saw the light June, 1844, and in London does not number a thousand members; but to use the words of their own Committee, 'They do not attach undue importance to numbers, as they know, that in the attainment of all spiritual objects, holy strength of character is of infinitely greater value than numerical legions.' There is another Society in the metropolis, working for a similar

Digitized by Google

a similar object, and perhaps more likely to be successful, humanly speaking, so far as co-operation is concerned, owing to the uniformity of religious creed by which it is characterized. The former Society has no narrower distinctive peculiarity than that of being 'Christian'; the latter is a 'Church of England' Young Man's Society. The two Societies, however, though at rivalry in appearance, are in friendship fundamentally. Moreover, they seek the same object in different fields of action; the latter Society chiefly exerting itself to awaken an interest in missionary objects. They both originated in the year 1844, but the members on the books of the Church of England Society are double those of the other. The test required for membership is a subscription, which shall be divided equally among four Church societies, having for object the spread of the Gospel abroad and at home. Those who are interested in the welfare of young men in London, those who reflect on the awful temptations to which they are exposed, will rejoice that two societies like these should strive in holy rivalry to stem the torrent of evil and attempt the regeneration of society on right principles. Religious young men have a rallying point. By mutual co-operation they are enabled to show a determined front to their worldly companions. The subject in which they are interested is not suffered to drop, their own minds are kept from lukewarmness. And all this is accomplished by suitable means which could be scarcely brought to bear by the single efforts of parochial clergymen. The Sunday-school is the best Christian young man's association which we have possessed heretofore; but here the young man imparts knowledge to others without any special opportunities for receiving it himself.

The lectures mentioned at the head of this article were delivered to an attentive crowd of more than four thousand persons, and will, perhaps, be read by more than fourteen thousand. This fact alone is a gratifying indication of what has been done by the Society of which we have been speaking. The Young Men's Christian Association owes much to the indefatigable labours of its able and devoted Secretary. By his personal influence and tact the most eminent men, belonging to different denominations, have been induced to give well-digested lectures to the multitudes assembled weekly in Exeter Hall. Great judgment has been shown in the choice of the lecturers, in the appropriation of subjects, and in assigning the proportion in which the established churches of England and Scotland and the different religious sects should be represented. The Bible was made the chief topic: and assuredly the study of the Bible devotionally, practically, and critically, is the most noble aim for a Christian Association. It has been shown that controverted questions of doctrine

Digitized by Google

doctrine and church-polity can be passed over in silence, and the word of God made the great theme. This brings men to unity of thought and aim; the more they study revelation at the fountain-head the more will they discover how little they know, and how much is to be learned, how partial are our views of truth, and how necessary it is to bear with the differences of other minds, from a conviction that it is impossible for all to look at the same subject from the same point of view. Each spectator (as optical science demonstrates) looks at a different rainbow from his neighbour, but all behold the same sun.

In noticing the plan adopted by this Society, we cannot but be reminded of its resemblance with that of this Journal. A series of lecturers, not abandoning their peculiar opinions, but contending for the Bible, its truth, its literary attractions, its provision and adaptation for the moral necessities of fallen man, are doing precisely what the contributors to this Journal have done from its commencement. We are the more reminded of this by discovering among the names of those who have lectured to the young men in Hull that of one of our own contributors.[b] We feel gratified that the attention of large bodies of men is being directed to subjects to which we are anxious to give prominence. A course of Scriptural investigation is urged to which the pulpit cannot give adequate help. In fact, we thank the Society for training for us a class of readers who will ultimately be qualified in their turn to give to the public the result of their matured thought.

The lecturers, who have taken the Bible as their immediate subject, are men well known to the Christian public. We have two Hugos, who have contended ardently and successfully pro veritate religionis Christianæ—men of zeal and eloquence, who, if they do not compare with their famed namesake in depth and variety of theological learning, have the happy faculty, so useful in this nineteenth century, of awakening the intellect and touching the sympathies of the masses. We have also the amiable author of 'Life in Earnest,' and 'The Mount of Olives,' works that are read by thousands. An elegant mind like his was well qualified, as we may conceive, to appreciate the literary beauties of the word of God and point them out to his hearers.

The three aspects of a divine revelation which these powerful minds have given to their numerous hearers form a most valuable combination. The Bible being shown to be self-evidential, we have the salient features of a revelation. Its great leading truths are brought out, and it is made plain that these truths are of God.

[b] Rev. O. T. Dobbin, LL.D., lectured on the Poetry of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Its

Digitized by Google

Its adaptation to the wants of man involves a deep analysis of human nature, and the revelation is considered in reference to that nature. The literary attractions are those which lie on the surface; they are the sculptured mouldings and painted ornaments of the vessel that holds the celestial nectar. Now these are widely different themes, but each of them relates to the Bible as a whole. Each of them keeps in view the one design, the one system, the one dictating Spirit. This is no crumbling of the bread of life, but recommends its humble reception in the proportions in which God has given it; and this, we think, involves the mode of thought needful for the present day. Men are beginning to take large views of most subjects; the controverted topics of the day are reduced to their fundamental principles, and there the battle is fought. One sees this in parliamentary debates, in popular lectures, in newspaper articles, in scientific researches. We have many mathematicians among our students of divinity, and readers of Adam Smith among politicians. Our statesmen are beginning 'to discern the little in the large, and the large in the small; studying the State in the citizen, and the citizen in the State.' Men are on all hands impatient of detail, and anxious to ascend to the general from the particular. The scholasticism of the middle ages is not relished; the verbal distinctions that savour of the old Greek criticism are not cared for, and men have no time to listen to them. Moreover, there is but slight disposition to discover a balance of authorities. Augustin may have said one thing, Irenæus another, Jeremy Taylor may state a doctrine in such and such terms, and Tillotson in others, but the modern listeners cannot store their memory with quotations; they are eager to know the text that will settle the question at once. Students still exist who delight in laborious research, who are content to be compilers ad infinitum; there are men who are exactly fitted to make blue-books crowded with collected facts; but it will be easier to find those who prefer the results to the details of their labours. We think that the divines who stood up in Exeter Hall consciously or unconsciously recognized this as the spirit of the age, and addressed themselves to it accordingly. Their treatises (for they are no longer spoken but printed words with which we deal) are comprehensive and full of thought, suggestive rather than exhaustive; they can hardly be called shallow, though confessedly they are popular, and, though short, much is conveyed. Mr. Stowell may be said to have considered the Bible objectively, Dr. M'Neile subjectively, and Mr. Hamilton philologically. The first takes the revelation, and proclaims its table of contents; the second takes human nature in conjunction, and enumerates a series of hidden correspondences; the third culls the flowers and scatters them on our path.

Mr.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Stowell enters upon his subject with an enthusiasm in which we ardently sympathize. He thus speaks of internal evidence:—

'We glory in the fulness, the amplitude, the clearness of what are commonly styled "the external evidences," but at the same time we glory still more in the fact, that if all the outworks were carried (which they never can be), the citadel itself would remain unmoved and immutable, because self-sustained. For my own part I have no hesitation in saying, that were all the external evidences gone, I should not for an instant be shaken in my conviction of the truth of the Gospel; I would stake my hope for eternity upon it as undoubtingly as before.'—p. 7.

Perhaps we may remark on his main subject, *internal evidence*, that it is not quite so independent of external as our lecturer would make it appear. This evidence, taken alone, appeals mainly to the feelings. It implies the doctrine of private judgment somewhat in extreme. A thing is pronounced true because we *feel* it to be true, and the morality is called Divine because we think it could not have been of human invention. Now, those who examine the internal evidence of the Bible are those who are well acquainted already with its external proofs. And if we carefully consider what we mean by convictions of this kind, we shall find them arising from previously received truths. We can scarcely have any *à priori* notions of a Divine revelation; but when once we have listened to the voice of the Saviour proclaiming his heavenly message, we are furnished with a test of truth, and analogy becomes a comparatively safe guide. Mr. Stowell must remember that were 'all the external evidences gone,' he would still retain the savour of them, the trained mind and heart, which by a species of intuition recognize what comes from God. The revealed facts of Scripture which we receive on historical evidence are the backbone of its anatomy. The incarnation of the Son of God, the Resurrection, the miraculous gifts, all these must be established in the mind, and the doctrines follow as it were by inference. We do not think it superfluous to discuss this point, as the notion of internal evidence may cut another way. It is the common argument on which many superficial readers justify their adherence to a particular author. 'There is a peculiar purity and elegance and *je ne sais quoi* about his writings which convinces me that what he says must be true.' This argument proves the orthodoxy of Channing or Emerson, and the inspiration of Plato or Homer. We have heard of an amiable Christian gentleman giving to the world an amended version of the Scriptures with improvements adopted from various translations. It did not appear that he had pretensions to scholarship, but he decided upon each alteration according to his preconceived notions. He *felt* that such and such a translation was the right one. Now, the

Digitized by Google

the internal evidence of inspiration is not unlike the internal evidence of right translation. We will just quote one text which we think bears upon this point. 'What man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth *no man* but the Spirit of God.'

Of what use then is internal evidence? Just this: it proves mutual consistency between the statements of the separate authors and the facts on which the revelation hinges. In rising from the perusal of the *Horæ Paulinæ* we feel convinced that the writers of the New Testament are mutually consistent, but it has not been proved to us that they are severally inspired. This must depend on external evidence. It is a nice point, on which we would gladly take Mr. Stowell's opinion, as to what are the truths exclusively revealed by inspiration. We can readily enumerate some which are indisputably so—particularly those which relate to the person and work of Christ, the personality of the Holy Ghost, and the mystery of the Trinity. There are others which are stated on authority and cleared from the doubt in which the guessings of heathen philosophers have left them, such as the doctrine of rewards and punishments, the future state, the entrance of sin into the world, and so forth. The *motives* of Christian morality are peculiar to the Gospel, but we cannot say that the principles of right and wrong are altogether hidden from mankind in any circumstances.

Mr. Hartwell Horne makes this remark on Bulkley's Notes on the Bible:—

'They are filled with what the author considers parallel passages in the Greek and Roman classics, in which the same moral precepts and sentiments occur. Sometimes *the coincidence appears to be striking;* at other times the correspondence is far from marked. There is a great mass of quotation which would seem to answer no valuable purpose, unless to produce the belief that a book nearly as good as the Bible might be compiled from the writings of the poets and philosophers of Greece and Rome.'

There are authors at the present day, against whom Mr. Stowell has nobly directed his shafts, who urge this with more sinister motives than Mr. Bulkley; we therefore press the necessity of a clear recognition of what is essential to a Christian revelation established by *all* the evidence that can be brought to bear. But to illustrate our meaning. Many portraits present 'internal evidence' of being unlike the sitter. The features obviously do not belong to each other: the portrait could have been like no one. But in analysing a better production, can we take each feature in succession, and, admiring the colour, and shading, and general execution, say, Must not that be like? No, we reply; we have a conviction that it is a good painting, and recognize a probability

Digitized by Google

a probability that it is an accurate transcript of the living face, but we should like the external evidence derived from a knowledge of the sitter himself.

We believe that Mr. Stowell would not refuse to acknowledge that some limit like that which we have suggested is necessary to give the doctrine of internal evidence its most real value. Indeed we cannot lay too much stress on its importance as auxiliary to direct evidence. Moreover, it is always most precious to the devotional reader of the Scriptures, as the heart and the conscience are able to give their testimony that to them the word of God addresses itself. Let Mr. Stowell speak on this point for himself:—

'It makes its appeal to that conscience within us which still witnesses for God, however our lusts and passions may sometimes clamour it down, or drag it at their chariot-wheels. There is in man a conscience which tells him what is right and what is wrong, at least in their broader distinctions; accompanying that perception of right and wrong there is a dread of guilt when we do wrong—a sense of satisfaction when we do right; and connected with that sense of guilt and of satisfaction there is the recognition of a great Supreme Judge. Conscience could indeed have no existence, or at least no power, if there were no Supreme Ruler to whose tribunal she must refer. Now this advocate for God in the human breast responds to the testimony of God in his word: "And he himself knew what was in man;" so it may be said of his Gospel, as it was said of Jesus, "It knows what is in man." It penetrates all the intricacies of his inmost labyrinths, it lights up all the dark recesses of the caverns of the heart, it holds up to the inner man a mirror which so reflects him upon himself that he cannot help recognizing the likeness, though there are lineaments, perhaps, which he had never discerned before, but which, when brought before him in that mysterious glass, flash conviction on his mind, so that he stands self-revealed and self-convicted, and owns that this is of a truth the word of God.'—p. 25.

The lecture of Dr. M'Neile is unquestionably the most important of the series. 'His aim [to use his own expression] was at once to quicken the intelligence and deepen the piety of his numerous young friends.' And we may safely conjecture that on no previous occasion was the attention of so large an audience held for two full hours upon a subject discussed with so much depth of thought. Dr. M'Neile has used no incitements of oratory, he has not appealed to the passions of his auditors, nor cared much to gratify the imagination. He had a great subject, and treated it with a master's hand. The delivery of this lecture to a breath-holding company of young men, gathered from among the shops and offices of this metropolis, is a sign of the times, and a gratifying one. It is a proof that the mechanical operations of the day are no barrier to intellectual activity in the evening. For assuredly,

assuredly, to listen to this lecture throughout, to lay up in the mind the well-arranged reasoning on a deep topic, and to preserve the continuous chain of ideas, was of itself a good mental exercise. But here the tact of the lecturer gave relief. He was himself at home in his subject, his own mind was clear, his ideas symmetrically connected, his reasoning consecutive, and his illustrations appropriate, so that he made it possible to his hearers to receive without weariness the successive steps of a complicated argument. Let other lecturers take the hint. Declamation, and trope, and mere oratory are only intellectual crutches, bribes offered to the sluggish understanding to induce the reception of solid truth. Let a man really be possessed of a stock of ideas with which he eagerly desires to endow his fellows, let him feel that he has a valuable treasure to give, and let him find those who are equally anxious to receive, he will somehow write or speak with intensity of purpose, simplicity of diction, and weightiness of argument, and his production will bear a favourable comparison with compositions that were chiefly intended to amuse and often to fill up time and paper. The attendants in lecture-halls begin to ask what they have learned or what has been proved, and not what pretty things have been said, or what jocose allusions have raised a laugh. We recommend Dr. M'Neile's lecture as a model, as realising our own beau-ideal of the best form of oral instruction. We would gladly employ Dr. M'Neile with reference to this as a lecturer to lecturers.

The main subject which the Reverend Doctor had to treat was Man. He rightly showed throughout that the knowledge of ourselves must go side by side with the knowledge of God. The Bible is of course the medium of communication, and is understood better in this relation as we advance in our insight into our own moral and intellectual constitution. To bring this before the minds of his hearers the lecturer has adopted an admirable analysis of his subject.

We subjoin his main propositions :—

'I. That some communications from God, such as those contained in the Bible, are necessary for fallen man. And,

'II. That the communications which are actually contained in the Bible are, in a remarkable manner, adapted to the necessities of fallen man.'—p. 3.

The first proposition is proved by reference to the inadequacy of all efforts, whether of ancient philosophy or modern scepticism, to solve the great problems in which man is so much interested, and to the fact that we have a revelation divinely attested and fixed in writing. On this latter point we will quote the lecture itself.

Digitized by Google

'To

'To have that truth handed down with a precision which shall entitle it to continued confidence, it must be *fixed*, and not left to the known and felt uncertainty of oral tradition. It must be *written*. And thus, a standard of truth which shall be fixed in itself, and in attestation of it miracles, which shall be matter of testimony, are shown to be not only desirable but indispensable to meet the necessities of fallen man. Such is the Bible in its contents and in its corroboration. The things to be believed were *written*, that no uncertainty might remain as to *what* they are; and they were *divinely attested*, that there might be no mistake as to *whence* they are.

'Let me add, they are all equally attested, though in themselves they are not all equally important. It is as true as divinely attested that the King of Assyria sent a great army into Palestine, as it is that a Virgin conceived and bare a son. It is as true as divinely attested that Cæsar Augustus, at a certain date, published a decree that the whole Roman empire should be taxed, as it is that Jesus of Nazareth rose from the dead. It is as true that David was guilty of adultery, as it is that Joseph resisted solicitation to commit the same sin. It is as true that Paul and Barnabas quarrelled and separated in their missionary labours, as it is that by means of these labours they diffused the blessings of salvation among the Gentiles. It is as true that Paul wrote to Timothy to bring with him the cloak left at Troas, and the books and parchments, as it is that he left Titus in Crete, to set in order things left undone, and ordain elders in every city.

'It is as true as divinely attested that the Jews said concerning Jesus, "He hath a devil, and is mad," as it is that Jesus said concerning himself, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." The genuine doctrine of inspiration does not require that all things contained in the Bible shall be of equal importance, but only that all is of equal veracity. All that is recorded there as having been done was done; all that is recorded as having been said was said; whether it was said by good men or by bad men, whether by the devil or by Jehovah, all was indeed said. And the standard of good and bad, the principles by which we are to judge between the good and the bad, the character of the devil and the character of God, all are clearly stated. We are not referred to a standard elsewhere, whether in ourselves or in other men, or in creation around, whereby to sit in judgment on the contents of the Bible, pronouncing some of them inspired and some of them not inspired. But we are supplied with a standard in the Bible itself, whereby to judge of the nature and comparative importance of things, all of which are given by inspiration of God, and attested by miraculous evidence.

'To say that we have a rectifying standard in ourselves is to say that fallen man possesses something superior to the Word of God, which is to make the Bible secondary, if not useless. Of what then can we judge? Of the *evidence* which attests the divine origin of the Bible. The evidence is a condescension to our lower faculties. "Believe *me*," said the Saviour, "or else believe me for the *very work's sake*." The miraculous work is an appeal to our senses, *i.e.*, a condescension to our infirmity. Reasonably satisfied thereby of the *origin* of the Bible, it is equally

Digitized by Google

equally reasonable, THEN, to submit to its *contents* even where they are above reason.'—p 12-14.

The second proposition referring to the necessities of fallen man has received division and subdivision, which, however, never interferes with the unity of the subject, or hides the great aim of the argument. The adaptation of the Bible to these necessities is made to appear by considering man:—

1st. As a compound creature, a mysterious combination of body and soul.

2nd. In the nature of his intellectual faculties, including memory, imagination, and reason.

3rd. In the diversities of his mental character.

4th. In his consciousness of guilt.

5th. In his instincts of desire.

It is obvious at a glance that these five points might be the headings of as many chapters in a thick octavo, and well would the Doctor be qualified to give them amplification. But he has lectured our young men suggestively; he has pointed out to them how the Bible is the great centre to which every other study can be directed. The first division relates to man as a creature endowed with senses, and indicates a path to the sciences which enable us intelligently to hold converse with the created world. The second division suggests the study of metaphysics, that study over which the labours of our Northern friends have spread a charm that transcends the delights of the novel or the poem. The third division sends us to biography, to the study in the individual of what metaphysics describe in the general. It includes also the inquiry into the causes of controversy, and leads to the discovery of unity amid variety. The fourth division includes the examination of conscience. It leads us to reflect on man as a moral being. It is the study of the closet when the door is shut, and no eye but of Him who seeth in secret is looking on. The fifth division is the key-stone of the rest, the history of human aims, and embodies the question, what is the chief good?

On all these points the Bible is shown to be a central book. The student of inspiration is made to see that all other study may be made subservient to it, but that none can be a substitute. The inference is clear that while all human productions are finite, and partial, and unsatisfying, this alone meets every want and leads us onward to the final good.

Mr. Hamilton has directed the attention of his numerous hearers to a subject of less importance than the lecturers we have described, but not less captivating. He draws a happy parallel between the beauty of creation and that of revelation, reminding us that

Digitized by Google

that man even in his ruin retains his sense of the beautiful as well as of the true. He has with unerring taste selected some of the beauties of the Bible, those which illustrate its sublimity and simplicity, its pathos and joyousness, its poetic descriptions of nature and its true portraiture of man. We have not space to do justice to the eloquent lecturer in these respects. The solid, instructive thoughts, however, of the lecturer might readily be compressed into a much shorter space than he has assigned to them. The lecture is in this respect in exact contrast to that of Dr. M'Neile. We can hardly guess why Mr. Hamilton should encumber himself with such a load of metaphors, and lose himself amid a labyrinth of words. We did not hear the lecture: his elocution probably made palatable his eloquence; but in reading it we wish that it were slightly weeded. We will just place in juxta-position Mr. Hamilton's admiring remarks on the style of Scripture, and a sentence or two of his own. He shall sit in judgment on himself.

'The rhetorical and poetical beauties of Scripture are merely incidental. Its authors wrote, not for glory nor display—not to astonish or amuse their brethren—but to instruct them and make them better. They wrote for God's glory, not their own; they wrote for the world's advantage, not to aggrandise themselves.'—p. 7.

Again:—

'Remembering then that the Bible contains *no ornamental passages*, nothing *written for mere display*, that its stedfast purpose is, "Glory to God in the highest," and the truest blessedness of man—I repeat that that Bible abounds in passages of the purest beauty and stateliest grandeur, all the grander and all the more beautiful because they are casual and unsought.'—p. 8.

Once more:—

'It never aims at fine writing. It never steps aside for a moment for the sake of a felicitous expression or a good idea.'—p. 17.

Here are Mr. Hamilton's canons of good taste. Let us see how he has obeyed them in a composition designed to show the beauties of *Scripture*, wherein we should expect the author to speak in plain prose while pointing out the magnificent poetry of the inspired volume.

'He has built Mont Blanc, and molten the lakes in which its shadow sleeps. He has intoned Niagara's thunder, and has breathed the zephyr which sweeps its spray. He has shagged the steep with its cedars, and besprent the meadow with its king-cups and daisies.'—p. 3.

'The fire which flashes from the iron hoof of the Tartar steed as he scours the midnight path is grander than the artificial firework; for it is the casual effect of speed and power. The clang of Ocean as he booms his billows on the rock, and the echoing caves give chorus, is more

Digitized by Google

more soul-filling and sublime than all the music of the orchestra; for it is the music of that main so mighty that there is a grandeur in all it does, in its sleep a melody, and in its march a stately psalm. And in the bow which paints the melting cloud there is a beauty which the stained glass or gorgeous drapery emulates in vain; for it is the glory which gilds beneficence, the brightness which bespeaks a double boon, the flush which cannot but come forth when both the sun and shower are there.'—p. 8.

'For the pensive, there is the dirge of Jeremiah and the cloud-shadowed drama of Job. For the sanguine and hopeful, there sounds the blithe voice and there beats the warm pulse of old Galilean Peter. And for the calm, the contemplative, the peacefully-loving, there spreads, like a molten melody, or an abysmal joy, the page—sunny, ecstatic, boundless—of John the Divine.'—p. 23.

'Suppose there were a missionary endowed with the gift of tongues, and called to ply his labours in different places at successive periods. He goes to France, and, addressing its vivacious inhabitants, he abandons the direct and sober style of his fatherland; every utterance is antithesis; every gem of thought is cut brilliant-wise; and the whole oration jigs on gay, elastic springs. He passes thence to Holland, and in order to conciliate its grave burghers his steady thoughts move on in stiff procession, trim, concinnate, old-fashioned, olderly. Anon he finds himself amidst a tribe of Red Indians; and instantly his imagination spreads pinions of flame, and, familiar with thunder, water, and burning mountains, his talk is the tune of the tempest. And ending his days in Arabia or Persia, through the fantastic sermon skip shadowy antelopes or dream-like gazelles, whilst each interstice of thought is filled by a voluptuous mystery, like the voice of the darkling nightingale as it floats through air laden with jasmine or roses.'—p. 24.

It is possible that Mr. Hamilton feels himself compelled to write and speak in this high strain. Like Ovid, he may lament—

'Et quod tentabam scribere versus erat;'

or he may consider that the poetry of Scripture would benefit by the contrast of his own. But in any case we repel it if only for the sake of example. It is a style easily imitated, and nothing is so difficult to write as good plain prose language that conveys the meaning of the author, and is not unbedecked with ornament when ornament is needed.

Mr. Hamilton is, however, deserving of our thanks, and has laboured in a good cause. Whoever enables his fellow-men to see a new beauty or a new truth in the sacred Scriptures, that they had not seen before, accomplishes a high end; whoever leads men to receive Him by faith who is the theme of the Bible, and is Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life, saves souls from death, and hides a multitude of sins.

Digitized by Google ON

ON THE INSPIRATION OF THE AUTHORS OF THE SCRIPTURES.

I. 'An intelligent theory of inspiration,' says Archdeacon Hare, 'is a most pressing want.' Abundant proof of the truth of this saying is afforded in the number of works, touching more or less on the subject, which are continually issuing from the press. Even Quarterly Reviews, in which we should least expect to find this subject discussed, have taken it up, and devoted to it a considerable portion of their space. And how many and various are the views entertained! The eleven degrees of inspiration reckoned up by Maimonides may now receive a considerable accession to their number.

It were absurd, within the limits of a paper like the present, to attempt to notice, however cursorily, the different theories propounded, or to think to supply the want of which Archdeacon Hare speaks. Our labour will be rather of a negative character. We propose to do no more than, first, expose briefly the total deficiency of proof for the theory commonly received; and, secondly, show the actual disproof of it in the statements of Scripture, adverting to some of the objections to which it is liable. But in doing this we shall be led to indicate the outlines (and the principles on which it rests) of that which we conceive to be the only tenable hypothesis; and shall notice certain arguments and objections adverse to this hypothesis which have lately appeared in similar papers on the subject. Our title will have shown that we do not propose to enter into many other questions, such as would, indeed, be essential to a complete treatise on the subject, but are, nevertheless, commonly overlooked: for example, the existence, degree, and perpetuity of inspiration in the subjects of the narrative, as, for instance—in those who are pronounced to be false prophets, or whose character may be doubtful,—in wicked men, as Balaam, Caiaphas, and others,—in ordinary persons and heathens, by some of whom a special influence or command from God is claimed, and this claim is recognized in some instances, as in the case of Pharaoh-Necho, who is said to have spoken 'from the mouth of God' (2 Chron. xxxv. 21-22), and of Cyrus, 'whose spirit the Lord is said to have stirred up in order that the prophecy of Jeremiah might be accomplished' (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22-23), and of others nothing is said either affirmatively or negatively;—or, again, the line to be drawn between the sayings and doings, and the writings of those who are presented to us in the characters of

Digitized by Google

of both actors and authors;—and, again, the inspiration of those who admitted the several books into the canon, and of those who edited them, and are supposed to have introduced explanations and emendations, and made certain additions. Neither do we propose to enter into questions of minute degree, as to the whole, or parts (*e. g.*, as between the Law, the Prophets, or the Hagiographa), or books, or portions of books,—of uniformity (as whether any law of variation,[a] identity, or progression throughout the Scriptures can be laid down),—of the manner, as between suggestion, elevation, superintendence, direction,—of the sense, whether it can be predicated universally either of the primary or the secondary, the literal or the spiritual, or, with propriety, of a twofold sense,—of the limitation, whether the inspiration of the authors of the Scriptures was a thing *sui generis*, limited to them, or common to them with other Christians down to the present times, as the Reformers did and many living divines do virtually hold when they speak of an existing intellectual guidance,—common even to heathens, according to the spiritualists of our day. Nor yet with regard to the authors of the Scriptures shall we touch upon the question of the perpetuity of their inspiration, with respect to which Davidson says,[b]—'Inspiration was an influence essentially and perpetually belonging to an apostle,—not a thing laid aside at times, and again assumed or given;' but Pye Smith declares,[c] 'It was not a perpetual quality, possessed and exercised at all times by those on whom it was conferred.'

Our main object will be to show how destitute of foundation from Scripture, and how untenable is the common theory of inspiration, and to this we now proceed. It may be proper to premise, however, that we do not propose to limit our remarks to the immediate effects of inspiration in the case of the Sacred Writers, but to include what appears to be necessarily involved in the doctrine,—as the providential preservation, free from corruption, of that which has been given by inspiration. In taking as a title 'the Inspiration *of the Authors* of the Scriptures,' we have had in view only to intimate that our subject will not embrace the particulars specified above.

II. The popular view of Scriptural inspiration (and in so designating it we do not forget that it is that which is maintained by the generality of orthodox divines even to the present day) may most appropriately be described in two maxims which have obtained almost universal acceptance. The one is the saying of Locke,

[a] 'In all ages of their (the Jews') history, divine inspiration was vouchsafed *in exact proportion* to the necessity of the case.'—Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. i. p. 284, note.

[b] *Introd. New Test.*, i. 143.

[c] *Scripture Testimony*, i. 90. —'The

Digitized by Google

—'The Bible has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth *without any admixture of error* for its subject-matter.' The other is found in the anti-Papistical dictum of Chillingworth,—'The Bible, *the whole Bible*, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants.' Now, it is obvious that if these assertions contain 'truth without any admixture of error,' the question is settled. Writers and speakers are bound in common honesty to consider the sense in which their words will be taken by those whom they address, and not to use terms which they know will convey an erroneous impression of their meaning to their hearers. If, then, we would not accuse those who invented, or those who commonly avail themselves of these maxims, of wilfully misleading the people, we must suppose them to intend that 'the *whole* of the Scriptures, *as we have them now* in the *English* language, is truth unmixed with a particle of error.' For such is unquestionably the sense in which the expressions are understood by the generality of people. And we are justified in interpreting them in the sense in which the speaker knows that they will be taken: and in which (we may add) we believe they are generally spoken. Suppose, however, that the Bible in the original languages is meant, and it will make no material difference.

But a much more reasonable doctrine of Inspiration has been held by many learned men, among whom may be mentioned, as subscribing to it more or less, Erasmus, Grotius, Episcopius, Le Clerc, Parry, Tomline, Coleridge, Arnold, Horne, and Pye Smith. This doctrine teaches that Inspiration is to be predicated only of THE TRUTH, 'that the writers were taught of God,' and 'wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost' only in respect of *religious doctrine;* and, consequently, being left in other matters to obtain their information in the ordinary way, and to use their own judgment in selection and composition, they were liable to error, and their works to corruption and deterioration. It is only in respect of religious teaching that we are warranted in asserting their freedom from all '*material error*,' only in respect of 'things necessary to salvation,' that we can or need claim for them absolute immunity from *all error*. With regard to other subjects—questions of chronology, history, natural philosophy, and the like—the truthfulness of their statements is as much open to inquiry as that of any profane writers. It is not of course intended that, in any respect, they knowingly misrepresented facts, but only that, not having any special enlightenment from above in earthly things, they were liable in these to err; because they possessed not in regard to them any knowledge or advantages beyond what were common to all of their time and nation. Their works also, in respect of any secular matters, were subject to be corrupted

Digitized by Google

corrupted to the same extent as any other writings, since as to these they were not divinely guaranteed.

1. In reference to these theories, we shall lay down and prove the two following propositions—the one on the negative side, the other on the positive:—*There* IS NOT *evidence adequate to prove that Inspiration extended to every chapter and verse of the Bible, and to every subject therein treated of; but the positive evidence reaches only to the extent of* ESSENTIAL RELIGIOUS TRUTH. *There* IS *evidence enough to prove that Inspiration did not extend to the former of these,* i. e. *to all parts and all subjects.*

(1.) There is no evidence to establish the verbal, nor even the universal-plenary inspiration of the Scriptures—we mean, that, on the positive side, Inspiration cannot be proved to extend beyond religious doctrine.

[1.] The Scriptures themselves are, of course, the only source of such evidence; and though many texts are adduced, there appear to be only a few of sufficient apparent force to be deserving our notice here. The first and incomparably the strongest, and that which of necessity is made to bear almost the whole burden of the proof, is—'All Scripture is given by inspiration of God' (2 Tim. iii. 16). Now, since it is admitted on all hands to be unsafe and illogical to rest an important doctrine on a controverted text, it would suffice to dispose of this, if we were to allege that no certainty can be attained as to the correct rendering of it. An equal if not greater number of authorities affirm that the text ought to be read thus:—'All Scripture (or "every writing") given by inspiration of God is also profitable,' &c.[d] In this version it is not determined what Scripture or writing *is* so given. But, waiving this objection, and taking as the most literal and correct rendering—'All' or 'Every Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable,' &c., this text will still contribute little towards the support of the plenary theory. In the first place, it refers only to the Old Testament Scriptures. In the next, it predicates inspiration of these only in the aggregate, or of each one of the particular writings as a whole; but it does not, therefore, necessarily affirm or intend it of *every part or every topic* of the whole or of each one. Nothing is more common with modern writers than to make assertions in reference to works as a whole,

[d] Among these authorities may be named the Vulgate, Luther, Calmet, the Spanish version, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and almost all the Fathers; Tertullian, the Port-Royal edition, Grotius, Hammond, two Arabic versions, Schleusner, Pye Smith, Macknight, Wakefield.

But the Syriac version, on account of its extreme antiquity, carries with it a weight inferior only to the Greek.

It is further alleged that, to justify the Authorized Version, the Original should have been in the plural, and have had the definite article, as in Luke xxiv. 27.

which

Digitized by Google

which are intended only of portions of them. Gaussen, the great advocate of Verbal Inspiration, for instance, in his *Theopneustia*, repeatedly asserts things of the Bible without limitation, which, it is evident, he can intend only of some few and scattered portions of it. If the exact modern theologian in an argumentative work uses this laxity of speech, how much more may it be expected to occur in the familiar epistle of a man of warm temperament, educated in the hyperbolism of the East? And how unreasonable is it to insist on interpreting, in the strictness of the letter, terms of universality occurring in a book characterized by the unrestricted use of such terms on almost all occasions? Verily, if this canon of interpretation were to be applied throughout, it would make the sacred writers contradict themselves, and utter the most palpable falsehoods in numberless instances. It were endless to refer to passages in which unlimited phrases are to be taken in limited, and sometimes extremely limited significations.

Another text, or rather class of texts, which, it may be proper to notice, is that in which the phrase 'the Word of God' occurs. Such texts are commonly adduced to prove the plenary and even verbal inspiration of the Bible, and of every part thereof. The remarks just made on the use of universal terms are equally applicable, and ought to form a sufficient answer in this case. But it may be further observed that this and similar phrases, when used to prove the inspiration of the Scriptures, are wholly misapplied. They do not furnish an iota of evidence on the point in question. *By 'the Word of God' is never meant in Scripture that collection of writings which we call the Bible.* How could it be, when it was not possible for them to be collected into one whole until all were written? Nay, it cannot be shown that these phrases are used in reference to a single book or passage of Scripture. 'The Word of God' means, in general, any single declaration from God of whatever kind, and, more particularly, the preached Gospel (2 Tim. iv. 2)—*the Divinely-revealed scheme of salvation.* It cannot be shown that it is ever used in reference to any other than a *religious* communication. It can, therefore, never prove that inspiration extends beyond this—that is, beyond what we admit and maintain. Consequently, the texts in which this and similar phrases occur do no more than support *our* theory.

There are two or three passages in our Lord's discourses in the 14th, 15th, and 16th chapters of St. John's Gospel, which are adduced as of primary importance in this controversy. To these we shall now advert, after quoting them:—

'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth.' 'The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in

Digitized by Google

in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you' (John xiv. 16, 17, 26).

'But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me, and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning' (John xv. 26, 27).

'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak; and he will show you things to come' (John xvi. 12, 13).

We have quoted more than was absolutely necessary to exhibit the argument, but the context has a too important bearing upon it to be omitted. Indeed, full justice cannot be done to our view of the case, without a perusal of the whole of the discourses.

It is hence contended that, as Christ promised his apostles that the Holy Ghost should '*teach them all things*,' and bring '*all things*' to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them, and should guide them into '*all truth*,' they must have been plenarily and universally inspired. Accepting, in the first place, this statement in the way it is made, we observe that the question turns on the same point as in the previous proofs, viz., on the Scripture use of terms of universality. Unless it can be shown that we are bound *invariably* to take these in a strictly literal sense, or, at the least, that there is something in the particular instance, or in its context, which requires us to do so in respect of it, such terms alone are insufficient to *prove* the point; since it is not enough to be able to say that they *may* have this meaning:—we must be able to show that they *must*, and that they cannot be taken in any other. This never can be shown. But it may, on the contrary, be affirmed with truth that the general rule with regard to their use is opposed to their being taken in a strictly universal sense, and hence that it will require other considerations than their occurrence to make it safe to predicate absolute universality in *any* instance. This, we conceive, is an answer alone sufficient to put these texts out of court.

But we will say further, that we shall be well content to let the decision of the whole matter turn on the question of right interpretation in the case of these passages.

There are but two senses in which they can be understood. Either, adhering to the strictly literal meaning of the words, we must suppose our Lord to have meant to promise the Apostles that the Holy Ghost should *absolutely* teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance that he had said unto them, and

Digitized by Google

and guide them into all truth; or, supposing him to have had in his mind 'the work which his Father had given him to do'—for which he 'came into the world,' and which was ever present to his thoughts—the truth to which he 'came to bear witness,' and of which he was 'the personification' (ch. xiv. 6), we must consider that his intention was to assure them that the Divine Comforter should teach them or recall to their recollection all things which it would be necessary for them to know in order to the fulfilment of their commission to 'preach the gospel to every creature'—that He should guide them into the whole system of Divine truth, which hereafter it would be their business to 'teach all nations.' According to the former of these two interpretations, Christ promised that every single thing, however trivial, private, or personal,—whether concerning their meals, or their occupations, or their journeyings,—literally, '*whatsoever he had said unto them*,' from the first to the last moment of their acquaintance with Him—should be brought to their remembrance. This, it will be said, is a positive absurdity. It is so; but it is obviously included in the 'all things' construed literally, and those must answer for it who will insist upon such a construction. Nay more, they must take the responsibility of giving just ground for the subversion of the Christian faith. God, we are persuaded by such conclusive evidence as nothing can surmount, does no one thing uselessly, and for no good end. Yet it is impossible, we suppose, for any one to believe that such universal reminiscences could answer any good purpose. If, then, this be the true interpretation of the text, every one is bound by a first principle to reject the claims of Christianity to be received as a revelation from God. But, again, according to the first view of this passage, the Holy Ghost was to teach the Apostles all things, and to guide them into all truth:—therefore, to communicate to them a perfect knowledge of all the arts and all the sciences, and to set them free from all errors in physics, metaphysics, and every other subject which the human mind can contemplate. But this, we know, he did not do. Consequently, carrying out this literal interpretation, a promise of Christ's would be made to have failed. And thus, on this ground also, his religion would be to be rejected. A construction which legitimately leads to such consequences cannot be defended by any Christian. Recourse must, therefore, be had to the only alternative; and the second interpretation, which limits the meaning to religious truth, must be adopted.

This sense, it is indeed most clear from the texts and their context, was that in which our Lord really spoke.

The original of John xvi. 13 proves the truth of this assertion beyond all doubt. It there appears that his actual promise was that

Digitized by Google

that the 'Spirit of Truth should guide them into all *the* truth,' meaning emphatically and only that truth which they were to go forth and publish to the world. That 'the truth,' as the phrase is used in the New Testament, is a synonyme for the Gospel, appears to be universally admitted. Scott explains it in this passage by 'the truth as it is in Jesus;' Archbishop Sumner by 'all the truth relating to the salvation of man;' Campbell by '*not omniscience*, but all *necessary* religious knowledge;' Dwight by 'all evangelical truth;' Trollope by 'not truth universally, but only in reference to a particular subject, and embracing a knowledge of those doctrines which were essential to their apostolic office,' &c.; and Calvin shows into what 'childish fooleries, the most absurd and stupid things that can be imagined,' we may be led by departing from this literal and true meaning. The passages which establish this sense of the expression are far too numerous to admit of citation here; we can do no more than refer to some of them. See John i. 17 (Greek); v. 33; xiv. 6; xvii. 19; xviii. 37; Rom. i. 18, 25; ii. 8; iii. 7; xv. 8; 2 Cor. iv. 2; xiii. 8; Gal. ii. 5, 14; iii. 1; v. 7; Eph. iv. 21; 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12, 13; 1 Tim. ii. 4; iii. 15; iv. 3; vi. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 18, 25; iii. 7, 8; iv. 4; Titus i. 1, 14; Heb. x. 26; James iii. 14; v. 19; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 2 (Greek); 1 John ii. 21; iii. 19; 2 John i. 2; 3 John iii. 8, 12.

Now with regard to the other part of the promise, which assured the Apostles that they should be taught all things, and have all things brought to their remembrance whatsoever Christ had said unto them, it evidently ought to be interpreted in consistency with the general purport of the passage, and especially with the text just expounded.

The most close connection subsists between the discourses in which these texts occur. The discourses stand in juxtaposition, were delivered on the same evening, and apparently without interruption of the conversation: the same tone, and topic, and peculiarities, run through both. They may indeed be considered as virtually one discourse, being only distinguished by a change of place. It is therefore most reasonable that we should interpret anything that may admit of doubt in one part by what appears to be more clearly spoken in another; and this is especially justifiable in the case of the texts before us, by reason of the remarkable parallelisms which occur in them, or in close connection with them, as will be seen by the citation above. There are two texts in each discourse which more immediately relate to the mission of the Comforter. In each the Holy Ghost is described by the peculiar titles of 'the Comforter' and the 'Spirit of the Truth;' in each he is to be sent by the Father, and also by Christ, or through his

Digitized by Google

his intercession and in his name; in each the object of his mission is described to be that he may supply Christ's place, and testify of him; and in each the subject of his communications is apparently the same. Can we then doubt that the promises are essentially identical, and that we may safely explain the one by the other? Can we hesitate to admit that the 'all things' of the one is nothing more than a variety of expression used to denote precisely the same as the 'all truth' of the other?—*i. e.* 'the system of truth generally necessary to salvation'?

This sense is borne out and demonstrated in both instances by the whole context and scope of the discourses. It is entirely of the deepest *spiritual* truths that Christ is speaking throughout: of loving Him and keeping His words—of dwelling in Him and in the Father—of the relation in which He stands to the Father—of the distinction and separation between His disciples and the world—of the indwelling of the Spirit—of His infinite love to His people, and His election of them—of the testimony which the Comforter, on His coming, should bear to Him, and the many new things and 'things to come' by the communication of which he should glorify Christ—of sin, righteousness, and judgment—of the joys and sorrows which awaited them, and of the final victory over the world. Who, in the midst of such high and holy themes—who, in the two most affecting and spiritual discourses which our Lord delivered—would expect to find one or two vague generalities, comprehensive of all merely secular things, and of all profane-historical truth? Who can admit an interpretation which, by thus diluting the essential with the non-essential, spoils the whole?

We feel that we have said more than was necessary, and have devoted more space than we can well spare, to the vindication of the true meaning of these texts; but we have been led to do so not merely for the refutation of an argument on which much stress has sometimes been laid, but also and chiefly, because when the true meaning of these texts is cleared and placed beyond all cavil and confutation, our opponent's weapon may be turned with irresistible force against himself. If, as we have demonstrated, Christ's promises extended only to all things necessary to the fulfilment of the Apostles' commission, it is unwarrantable to contend for an accomplishment of it beyond this. A possession greater than the promise cannot be maintained; and as the promise related only to the things of religion, Inspiration can be predicated only in respect of these. At any rate, until it is proved that a Divine guarantee against error on other subjects—historical, chronological, and the like—was essential to the conservation of the faith, it may hence be inferred that none was accorded in these profane matters.

And further it should be observed that, if the Apostles were themselves

Digitized by Google

themselves inspired only in respect of religious truth, the sanction which they have given by allusion, quotation, or express testimony, to the Jewish Scriptures cannot extend the guarantee of Inspiration (so far at least as their authority goes) to any other subject treated of in those Scriptures. Expressions of theirs, indicating a belief in any of those numbers or historical facts which are not essential to the plan of salvation, would demand our acceptance no more than those of wholly uninspired men, for they would be uninspired opinions. Nor, it may be added, would the sanction of Christ himself, given to the narrative of any fact or event, necessarily imply original inspiration with regard to it, since historical truth alone would be implied in such sanction. Thus these texts would alone suffice to *dis*prove extra-religious Inspiration.

We have now noticed all the principal passages which are alleged in support of the theory of universal Inspiration. The few that remain, compared with the foregoing, are of no weight; and the support of the former being withdrawn, they must, it cannot be denied, prove insufficient. Their contexts will in general show either that the prophetical element (as in 2 Pet. i. 21), or 'the things of God' (see 1 Cor. 2), were alone contemplated by the writer; and if in any instance this is not clearly evident, a reasonable presumption will arise from the general rule that such was the case, and at any rate it will be impossible to prove the contrary.

[2.] We may just add one remark, which will apply generally to what has been said above, with regard to the extent to which the Apostles conceived themselves to be inspired. St. Luke's introduction to his Gospel appears to us to afford a strong indication of his sentiments on this point. In it he sets forth the sources whence he drew his information, which he does not assert to have been more than human; and he claims to be believed only on the ground of 'having traced out everything accurately from the first.' He proposes to set forth in order a statement of those things which had been received among Christians on the testimony of those who, 'from the beginning, were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word;' he professes only to record events which had happened; and, merely as an historian, he appears to have had no thought of an influence of the Spirit being either necessary or given. If he had, would he not in such an introduction have asserted his claim to it; especially seeing that his declared object was to supersede other accounts more or less defective and faulty, and to give his friend certain information with regard to those things in which he had been instructed? Nothing could so effectually and readily have secured both these ends as a declaration that all he wrote would be composed under the guidance and sanction of the Holy Spirit:

Digitized by Google

Spirit; but the fact was that such Inspiration was promised only for *one definite and specified subject*; and whenever he exceeded the limits of that subject, and exercised his discretion as an historian in collecting, arranging, and recording the facts (sometimes alluding to civil and other matters which formed no part of the 'truth'), he had no warrant for claiming Divine guidance, and therefore could not assert it generally. The case would obviously be the same with regard to his second treatise; and if with regard to these, why not also with respect to the other historical writings of the New Testament, and, *à fortiori*, of the Old Testament? On the whole, it can be predicated only that the Scriptures affirm that the *revelation of religious truth* contained in them was written under the superintendence of the Spirit of God.

(2.) In strictness, it would be sufficient to have shown that the texts adduced to prove the universal inspiration of the Scriptures are insufficient for the purpose. We cannot be required to receive a doctrine which is wanting in positive proof. Nevertheless it may be expedient to demonstrate the second proposition, viz.: there is evidence to *disprove* every theory which makes Inspiration extend beyond the religious element.

[1.] In order to prepare the way for a more concise statement of a summary view of this evidence, we must first lay down certain general principles which appear to be obvious deductions from the essential nature of Inspiration.

The definitions of Scriptural Inspiration are very many, but all those which proceed from orthodox divines agree in making a special supernatural influence of the Spirit to be of its essence. If this be the case, then the following propositions are demonstrable from its essential characteristics:—

i. Inspiration cannot be predicated wherever it may reasonably be affirmed that none could be necessary. And yet, self-evident as this rule would seem to be, none is more transgressed—nay, strange as it appears, Inspiration is not only claimed for that in which it is at the same time granted that the occasion did not require it, but even for that in which it is virtually admitted that it did not operate! The Bible is said to contain Scriptures inspired throughout, in every part and on every subject. Then, this Inspiration is explained to consist only, to a great extent, in a *superintendence* of the Spirit, who ordinarily left the writers to themselves in the conception and enunciation of their thoughts, and interposed only when the occasion required, which might be but seldom.

Now this is a manifest perversion of the term 'Inspiration.' It is never used in any of its significations (and four or five might be named) to denote or include a mere surveillance. It invariably expresses *a positive action* on the subject of it, and is never com-

 prehensive

Digitized by Google

prehensive of a mere negative looking on. In fact, a negative or non-influencing inspiration is a contradiction in terms: it were equivalent to saying a non-acting action. The word, in fact, denotes 'an embreathment' (Coleridge), 'a breathing into' (Johnson), 'an infusion of ideas into the mind by a superior power' (Walker), 'the communication of a strong moral sentiment or passion' (Crabbe), 'an overpowering impression made upon the mind by God himself' (Watts), 'the being moved (φερόμενοι, borne along) by the Holy Ghost' (2 Pet. i. 21); and to the same purport speak almost all writers and divines in their definitions, though afterwards they tacitly slip in that which is neither influence, assistance, nor guidance: thus arises a monstrous fallacy and a gross deception. What would be thought of a *moral* Inspiration being made to consist in general of a negative supervision? Would it not be deemed an absurdity and a contradiction? When we pray that 'God would cleanse our hearts by the Inspiration of his Holy Spirit,' do we not contemplate an ever-operating and energetic action of the Spirit? Or, do we mean to pray only that the Spirit would watch us in our spiritual conflicts, and interpose in great emergencies when we might otherwise fall into 'deadly sins'? A mother with outstretched arms, watching over the tottering steps of her infant in its first attempts to walk, may be taken as an apt illustration. So long as her hands touch it not, she does not support, influence, or assist it in its progress: the act of standing or walking is wholly its own, and it would be manifestly wrong to use any term which conveyed that she did. Such a term could only be used with propriety when and while her guiding hand was applied to her child: the action might *then* be imputed wholly or partially to the mother, but not before. And just so Divine Inspiration (which must denote, if it denote anything distinctive at all, an influence from God) can only be predicated from the time when it began, and with respect to the parts and subjects in which it actually operated. Where a Divine influence has had no part in producing an effect, the action must have been wholly that of the human subject; and how deceptive, in such a case, to use a term indicative of a Divine co-operation, at the least! Where it has been exerted, the action may have become either simple or complex—either that of God alone, or of God and man combined; but more probably the latter, more or less, in every case, for it would seem that a transit through a human mind would be necessary for the humanizing (that is, the reduction and adaptation to the human level) of Divine ideas.

Nothing can be of more importance in this question than to be on our guard against a sophism, which thus imputes Inspiration where it is admitted not to have been necessary—nay, not to have even

Digitized by Google

even existed; for this fallacy being made obvious, the controversy is to a great extent determined. If our opponents intend only to claim Divine *superintendence* for the whole, and active influences but for parts, they ought to substitute the term 'superintendence' for 'Inspiration' in speaking of the entire Scriptures. Let them do this, and our theory will be as good as proved, since an indefinite extent of purely human matter in the Bible will be conceded.

ii. Where Inspiration is, there we may expect to discern some indications of knowledge or wisdom superior to that possessed by people of the same age and nation; and in proportion as we are unable to discover such, we shall rightly hesitate to admit claims to Inspiration, and even reject those claims, if we certainly discern a relative ignorance and deficiency.

iii. The doctrine of Inspiration involves the exclusion of error and corruption from the subject-matter of Inspiration, and within the sphere to which it extends. Hence, where error is proved to exist, there Inspiration cannot be; neither can it have been —unless, indeed, the communication was designed only to accomplish a special and temporary end, in which case the exception would not affect our present question. For example, inspired writings may not only have been corrupted but lost. This, however, could have happened only because they had accomplished the end for which God gave them, having been designed merely to meet the special exigencies of the time then present. Hence also, where perfect substantial agreement is not found, there can be no Inspiration; for want of harmony proves error on one side or the other, truth being one and perfectly consistent and harmonious. The same truths may be variously expressed and illustrated, but there cannot be the smallest inconsistency in the enunciation of any doctrine, nor discrepancy in the statement of any fact, if they have been indited under the special guidance of the Omniscient God.

iv. Inspiration involves adaptation to the capacities of those to whom the communication is addressed. Hence the communication must have been made and preserved in such an intelligible form that competent persons among those for whom it was designed, or to whom it came, might be able to discover and declare with certainty the true meaning of every inspired statement. Conversely, where this is not the case, Inspiration cannot be predicated.

Thus a worthy occasion, superior wisdom (relatively), truth without any admixture, phase, or shadow of error, and clear intelligibility, are the attributes and characteristic marks of every special communication from God.

[2.] It may seem superfluous to offer any observations in confirmation

Digitized by Google

firmation of this statement. Nevertheless the importance of the principles involved in it may well justify a few remarks.

i. That a most rigid and admirable economy universally pervades the whole system of the Divine procedure is admitted by divines and philosophers with one consent; and it can need no demonstration that God does nothing without occasion, or beyond the occasion.

Indeed that this principle even more invariably characterises the actings of the Deity than uniformity does the laws of nature, will appear from the consideration that *this* is a self-prescribed rule of self-government, which is therefore as eternally immutable as are the will and nature of Himself; while *those* laws are operations external to Him, assigned to the creations of his hand during his pleasure, and for a time only, and which consequently not only may at any moment be suspended or changed, but which must at length have an end.

If the proposition that God might use any unnecessary expenditure of means in the *common* course of his Providence would be immediately rejected as incredible, the hypothesis of such a thing occurring in any *extraordinary* acting of his should be treated as simply absurd.

The various readings and the difficulties of interpretation which exist more or less in every book of Scripture, and which can alone be satisfactorily accounted for on this principle of non-intervention beyond the limits of urgent necessity, further establish it.

ii. Our first proposition is an obvious deduction from, or rather it is a particular included in, the economic principle. There must be necessity, or there would not be economy. Hence all mere history, chronology, genealogy, or information of whatever kind that might be obtained through the ordinary channels of knowledge, or with regard to which it might be obvious that no necessity for special revelation existed, would be without the province of Inspiration. We know that it will forthwith be objected that we are not competent judges where a necessity exists. Granting this to be true in some cases, it will not follow that it is in all, unless it can be asserted that, because we cannot judge in every instance, therefore we can judge in none. Putting out of the question everything with regard to which a reasonable doubt can be entertained, we apprehend that much, very much will remain (and amongst it all that we have specified above), respecting which no rational doubt can be felt.

iii. Again, proceeding on the same principle, we may safely infer that the Almighty would in no case make a special communication to his creatures—still less supersede the laws of nature for the sake of it—unless its subject-matter were of supreme value and

Digitized by Google

and importance, and unless it imparted some wisdom and knowledge superior to that which was previously possessed by its recipients, or which they could attain by the use of their unassisted faculties. It might happen indeed, through the weakness of their nature, that they might not be able to discern this superior wisdom in every particular, and certainly not in *any* particular *to its full extent*—nay, in many, they might see nothing surpassing the capabilities of man's faculties; and this, by reason of the corruption of human nature, would be especially the case in things of a moral and spiritual kind. Still more would such an inability to judge necessarily occur, if the Almighty, acting upon a pre-ordained plan, were pleased to make a revelation in detail—step by step, in divers manners and at distant times—unfolding, as it were, by slow degrees, 'the roll of the book.' It were then as unreasonable to expect to discern a superior excellency in each introductory stage, and in every separate particular, as to expect to perceive the full meaning and bearing of each sentence, paragraph, and part of a manuscript while it was only partially unfolded. On the other hand, it were no less incredible that we should not find, when the Divine revelation was completed, and its scope and scheme made manifest so that we could view it as a whole, a miracle of wisdom in its systematized completeness, and a surpassing excellency of knowledge and adaptation in each and all of its component parts; and further, though we may not be competent to discern the positive superiority of each separate item, especially in the early stages of a gradually-developed revelation, yet on the negative side we may infallibly predicate the falsehood of the claim to Divine Inspiration in any case (or perhaps we should rather say, as to any subject) in which we find evident marks of a weakness below that of the ordinary run of mortals, or of an inferiority of knowledge as compared with what had been independently attained by any other peoples, whether antecedent, contemporaneous, or subsequent.

iv. Resting on the same indisputable principle of economy as characteristic of all the Divine actings, we maintain the absolute truth, free from the liability at any time to the entrance of error, of every special communication from God.

Could the Divine Spirit, in the first instance, specially guide the pen of a writer, suggesting to him superhuman thoughts and controlling him in the utterance of them, and yet suffer him to mar or dim the beauty of their truth by the admixture of aught human,—that is, of error, for 'to err is human' in every sense, and relatively to God in every thought and act? Or could He, having once delivered to man a sacred deposit of perfect truth, have left it unguarded to man's care or rather carelessness,—obnoxious to the mutations, and subject to the corruptions which everything

Digitized by Google

everything placed in mortal hands must needs undergo? These two come practically to the same thing, and both are alike inconsistent with the attributes and actings of the Supreme Being. If he has suffered any particle of the truth which he designed to reveal to fail before it reached those for whom it was destined, it must have been because He wanted either the power or the will to secure its accurate enunciation or its uncorrupted transmission. But, that he had the power none will deny, and that he had the will is a condition of the proposition. Moreover, for God to interpose to communicate any one truth or system of truths for the benefit of any of his creatures, and not to will the delivery thereof in its integrity to those creatures, would be to act in vain, —would be a manifest violation of the economic principle, and that, not merely in His ordinary actings, but in a special, supernatural intervention in which it could be infinitely less recognized.

It is not competent to us to say that this imperfection, of whatever kind it may be, did not proceed from God, but was introduced by man, or is attributable to his weakness or want of care. If God has caused a special communication from Himself to be written under the guidance of his Spirit for the whole human race, his Attributes are pledged for the preservation of it. And if it were not so—if a Divine Revelation could be obnoxious to error —if, having been once given, it ceased to have the special care of God's Providence, and were altogether left to the ordinary means of conservation and channels of transmission, the case would be far worse. Experience must convince us that so great and certain are the changes which will enter into everything depending wholly upon man, that there could be no assurance at any period of the essential purity of the Divine record. It might be, and the probability is, that in the course of the many ages which have passed since Moses or even Christ lived, it must have been corrupted even in some of its fundamental truths: and it would amount to a positive certainty that a time would come, however remote (supposing the world to continue in existence), when every particle of the Divine message would have been eliminated by the unperceived but sure operation of those universal laws which stamp mutability upon all sublunary things. We must, therefore, if we would contend for a Divine Revelation at all, maintain that He who gave it has preserved and will preserve it in all its integrity,—that whatsoever has been given by inspiration of God is unchanged and unchangeable.

In addition to these necessary deductions from the attributes of God, we may adduce even Divine authority in confirmation of our position.

Our

Digitized by Google

Our Lord's declaration in reference to the law of Moses (Matt. v. 18) may surely be taken to lay it down as *a principle of universal application* that not one iota or tittle shall in anywise pass from any communication made by Divine Inspiration, until it has attained its end. If this could be predicated of the Law—then, *à fortiori*, of the Gospel. But, whatever effected a change,—whether addition or diminution, variation or corruption, must take at the very least an iota from it. As surely then as the word of Christ cannot fail, 'every word that has proceeded out of the mouth of God' must be incorruptible and invariable.

v. The same principle and line of argument establishes with regard to every inspired statement its necessary intelligibility by all those for whom it was designed, not being greatly deficient in the moral or intellectual endowments of their species.

God, being perfectly acquainted with the capacities of the human mind and its modes of communication,—knowing every language, even to the nicest propriety of expression, must be fully able to secure the delivery of such information as he deems worthy of being specially communicated, in a manner clear and intelligible to the human race beyond the power of any mere man. To suppose Him to will to inspire a writer to record any communication from Himself, and having the power to cause him to record it in the best and clearest terms, not to will to do so, would amount to the extreme of irreverence and contravention of His attributes.

It results then, on the whole, from these severally demonstrated principles that, with regard to whatever subject and to whatever extent, no worthy occasion, no superiority of knowledge or wisdom, existing erroneousness or inconsistency in any degree, or want of intelligibility by men of ordinary capacity and candour may be truly affirmed, in that and to that extent, Inspiration cannot be predicated.

[3.] But is it not undeniable that many narratives of unimportant matters—many allusions to things trivial—many instances of ignorance, error, and obscurity are found in the Bible? It certainly cannot be denied that this is asserted, and that the assertion is supported by an amount of evidence very difficult (to say the least) to rebut.—Nay, it is conceded by orthodox believers in and advocates of Christianity, and of the Bible as the medium of a supernatural revelation, that there may be found in the Scriptures on merely secular subjects inaccuracies, or inconsistencies, or errors, or discrepancies, or contradictions, and it is admitted on all hands that there are many thousands of various readings and difficulties of construction, which render the meaning more

Digitized by Google

more or less doubtful.* Our space does not admit of the adduction even of a few examples in illustration of our position. Nor is it necessary that we should adduce any; for a sufficiency to serve the purposes of our argument is patent to every one who is not determined to shut his eyes to the truth. We will only say for ourselves that we entertain a strong conviction that any candid inquirer who takes up the works of none but orthodox Christian advocates,—such as those of Horne and Davidson, expressly devoted to the reconcilement of inconsistencies and the obviating of objections and having all the advantages to be obtained from the conjectures and investigations of past ages,—will feel dissatisfied with the great majority of solutions in reference to writings *considered as inspired*, and will rise from an impartial consideration of the best attempts that can be made, fully convinced that it is utterly vain to maintain the entire freedom (original or actual) of the Scriptures from all errors and discrepancies. The above-named and other authors, in many instances, mutually exclude and deny the validity of each other's solution, and thus become witnesses on the opposite side. And, in a multitude of instances, they have no alternative but to resolve the alleged contradiction into corruption; which, to say the least, is to admit that 'the *whole* of the Scriptures,' as we have them now, was not 'given by inspiration of God;' and therefore, as we maintain, was not originally given by a special interposition of that unchangeable One who does nothing in vain.

In place of adducing any examples in proof of the position we

---

* We subjoin a few extracts, which we happen to have at hand, *as specimens*, taken from writers of different schools, admitting more or less either the general principles of our theory, or substantiating the above statement.

'We must receive their conclusions, but not their premises, unless they affirm the premises as expressly as they do the conclusions.'—(Burnet on *Articles*, p. 104.)

'It is not the object of God to reveal natural and physical, but spiritual truth only.'—(Close, in *Sermons on Genesis*, p. 14.)

Lowth (on *Inspiration*) admits that it did not extend to the common occurrences of life, or to things not relating to Divine truths,—nor to matters of mere prudence,—nor to discourses on things of which Christ told the apostles they must remain ignorant, as of the day of judgment and the restoration of Israel.

Archbishop Tomline, in *Elements of Theology*, vol. i, pp. 2–8, and (quoting Parry) pp. 289–295, asserts only freedom from '*material error*.'

The *British Critic* (No. 41, p. 98 *sqq.*). 'The fact is at once awful and undeniable that the imperfections of man have mingled themselves with the Word of God—variations, mistakes, and interpolations of transcribers and translators, false readings, and unintelligible passages.' . . . 'Our negligences and ignorances, our weaknesses and frauds can leave their stains even upon the Bible.' . . . 'With respect to the acknowledged *accommodations* of the Bible, there is a mighty difference whether God has made them or has only suffered them; and again, unphilosophical *forms of expression* upon points in which the primary design is not involved are only natural,—and perhaps they are serviceable *as coming from man to man*, and yet they are things from which our feelings might recoil, if we conceived of them as actually and immediately coming *from God to man*.'

maintain,

Digitized by Google

maintain, we shall presently quote some passages from an able advocate of the view we oppose—which, while bringing under consideration the most that can be said in support of that view, will furnish us with a full admission of the existence of *real* discrepancies. This admission is all that we need, even though it be limited to never so few instances. The recognition of but one real error or inconsistency, however small, subverts the grand principle of our opponents' theory, and establishes ours. Henceforth it becomes a question of degree only. We know not on what ground it can be maintained that one, two, or ten discrepancies may and do exist; but that 20, 100, 1000, or 10,000 cannot by possibility do so: or that historical errors may occur; but not physical, chronological, and so on: or that a *small* error may have been made; as of a few years in chronology; but that a *great* one, as in the two tables in Gen. v. and xi. (which, by the way, involve the greatest difficulties, and have been clearly proved to be unhistorical,[f] but *which cannot be accounted for on the ground of corruption*), cannot possibly be erroneous.[g] We conceive, therefore, that the admission above alluded to may well supply the place of any proof of our position that errors do really exist in all secular subjects; and consequently that there is but one (being of a wholly different kind to these), in reference to which an attempt can be made to maintain within certain limits its absolute immunity from error. That subject is, of course, Religion. It is of this alone,—using the term here to denote the grand scheme of salvation as gradually developed through the whole Bible, including the fundamental principles of the Gospel and the previous dispensations so far as they were preparatory for and introductory to the Gospel,—that we can predicate a worthy end, a superior wisdom, an absolute truth, and a

[f] See *Journal of Sacred Literature*, No. 3; *Vindication of Protestant Principles*, pp. 137-146; and Bunsen's *Ægypten Stette*, i. 201 *sqq*.

[g] 'It would follow clearly that the narrative into which any error, however trifling, had found its way, could not have been written by divine inspiration. I do not mean that, if the history of a divine revelation were incorrect in any trifling point, we could argue that the revelation itself must be false: far from it; the revelation may be truly a revelation; but it would be clear that the history of it could be no more than a human production, and, as such, not incapable of error, even though substantially true.

'Now it will appear that the remaining difficulties in the Scriptures, such, namely, as are not of a religious character, together with the objections urged against particular miracles, on the ground of some alleged improbability in the narrative of them, are of a nature, for the most part, not to invalidate the *truth of revelation*, but merely *the inspiration of the historical record of it*. It is only the inspiration of the books of Scripture, and not their general truth, and far less the truth of the revelations recorded in them, that is or can be affected by the great majority of objections, critical, scientific, historical, and chronological, which have been brought at different times against various parts of the Bible.'—ARNOLD'S *Sermons*, ii. 472.

perfect

Digitized by Google

perfect intelligibility. For this only therefore do we, or can we, claim Divine Inspiration. And what need we more? If we have in the Bible A DIVINE RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE, what more can *we* desire, or can it be more fitting in *God* to give? Why should we not rest satisfied with maintaining—that which alone *can* be maintained to the conviction of intelligent and unprejudiced minds, namely,—that the Bible *contains* a Divine Revelation—not that it *is*, as a whole, the Revelation—that 'the whole inspired word of God is in that book, though not the whole of that book is the Inspired Word;' that the Bible, in respect of 'THE TRUTH,' but of this alone, 'has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any admixture of error for its subject-matter;' that 'the Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the medium of historical revelation;' that 'Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation,' and 'was given by Inspiration of God,' though all things contained in it are neither necessary to salvation, nor were given by Inspiration of God.

(3.) We now proceed to consider specially *the argument* to which we have just alluded, *in favour of the plenary theory* of Inspiration. This argument, as exhibited in an excellent article on Reason and Faith in the *Edinburgh Review* of October, 1849, will present to us in the newest and best form all that can be said to obviate the objections and difficulties that necessitate, as we conceive, the adoption of our theory.

[1.] To do justice to it, we must in the first instance quote at some length from that part of the article which is intended to supply an answer to all objections. (The italics are by the author quoted.)

'The objections to the truth of Christianity are directed either against the evidence itself, or that which it substantiates. Against the latter, as Bishop Butler says, unless the objections be truly such as prove contradictions in it, they are "perfectly frivolous;" since we cannot be competent judges either as to what it is worthy of the Supreme mind to reveal, or how far a portion of an imperfectly developed system may harmonise with the whole; and perhaps, on many points, we never can be competent judges, unless we can cease to be finite. The objections to the *evidence itself* are, as the same great author observes, "well worthy of the fullest attention." The *à priori* objection to miracles we have already briefly touched. If that objection be valid, it is vain to argue further; but if not, the remaining objections must be powerful enough to neutralise the entire mass of the evidence, and in fact to amount to a proof of contradictions,—not on this or that minute point of historical detail,—but on such as to shake the foundations of the whole edifice of evidence. It will not do to say, "Here is a minute discrepancy in the history of Matthew or Luke as compared with that of Mark or John;" for, first, such discrepancies

Digitized by Google

pancies are often found, in other authors, to be apparent, and not real, —founded on our taking for granted that there is no circumstance unmentioned by two writers, which, if known, would have been seen to harmonise their statements. We admit this possible reconciliation readily enough in the case of many seeming discrepancies of *other* historians; but it is a benefit which men are slow to admit in the case of the sacred narratives. There the objector is always apt to take it for granted that the discrepancy is real; though it may be easy to suppose a case (and a possible case is quite sufficient for the purpose) which would neutralise the objection. It may be objected, perhaps, that the gratuitous supposition of some unmentioned fact which, if mentioned, would harmonise the apparently counter-statements of two historians cannot be admitted, and is, in fact, a surrender of the argument. But to say so, is only to betray an utter ignorance of what the argument is. If an objection be founded on the alleged absolute contradiction of two statements, it is quite sufficient to show any (not the real, but only a hypothetical and possible) medium of reconciling them; and the objection is, in all fairness, dissolved. And this would be felt by the honest logician, even if we did not know of any such instances in point of fact. We do know, however, of many. Nothing is more common than to find, in the narration of two perfectly honest historians,—referring to the same events from different points of view, or for a different purpose,—the omission of a fact which gives a seeming contrariety to their statements; a contrariety which the mention of the omitted fact by a third writer instantly clears up. Very forgetful of this have the advocates of infidelity usually been: nay (as if they could make up in the number of their objections what they want in weight), they have frequently availed themselves not only of apparent contrarieties, but of mere incompleteness in the statements of two different writers, on which to found a charge of contradiction. Thus, if one writer says that a certain person was present at a given time or place, when another says that he and two more were there; or that one man was cured of blindness, when another says that two were,— such a thing is often alleged as a contradiction; whereas, in truth, it presents not even a difficulty—unless one historian be bound to say not only all that another says, but just so much and no more. Let such objections be what they will, unless they prove absolute contradictions in the narrative, they are as mere dust in the balance, compared with the stupendous mass and variety of that evidence which confirms the substantial truth of Christianity. And even if they establish *real* contradictions, they still amount, for reasons we are about to state, to dust in the balance, unless they establish contradictions not in immaterial but in vital points. The objections must be such as, if proved, leave the whole fabric of evidence in ruins. For, secondly, we are fully disposed to concede to the objector that there are, in the books of Scripture, not only *appurent* but *real* discrepancies,—a point which many of the advocates of Christianity are, indeed, reluctant to admit, but which, we think, no candid advocate will feel to be the less true. Nevertheless, even such an advocate of the Scriptures

Digitized by Google

tures may justly contend that the very reasons which necessitate this admission of discrepancies also reduce them to such a limit that they do not affect, in the slightest degree, the substantial credibility of the sacred records; and, in our judgment, Christians have unwisely damaged their cause, and given a needless advantage to the infidel, by denying that any discrepancies exist, or by endeavouring to prove that they do not. The discrepancies to which we refer are just those which, in the course of transmission of ancient books, divine or human, through many ages—their constant transcription by different hands—their translation into various languages—may not only be expected to occur, but which *must* occur, unless there be a perpetual series of most minute and ludicrous miracles—certainly never promised, and as certainly never performed—to counteract all effects of negligence and inadvertence, to guide the pen of every transcriber to infallible accuracy, and to prevent his ever deviating into casual error! Such miraculous intervention, we need not say, has never been pleaded for by any apologist of Christianity; has certainly never been promised; and if it had—since we see, *as a matter of fact*, that the promise has never been fulfilled—the whole of Christianity would fall to the ground. But then, from a large induction, we know, from numberless examples of *other* writings, what the maximum is, and that it leaves their substantial authenticity untouched and unimpeached. No one supposes the writings of Plato and Cicero, of Thucydides and Tacitus, of Bacon or Shakspeare fundamentally vitiated by the like discrepancies, errors, and absurdities, which time and inadvertence have occasioned.'—*Edin. Rev.*, Oct. 1849, pp. 340–4.

'Within such limits as these, the most consistent advocate of Christianity not only *must* admit—not only may *safely* admit—the existence of discrepancies, but may do so even with advantage to his cause; for the admission is a reply to many objections founded on the assumption that he must contend that there are *no* variations, when he need only contend that there are none that can be material. But it may be said, "May not we be permitted, while conceding the miraculous and other evidences of Christianity, and the general authority of the records which contain it, to go a step further, and to reject some things which seem palpably ill-reasoned, distasteful, inconsistent, or immoral?" .... This is of the very essence of Rationalism; and it may be called the Manichæism of interpretation.'

To 'receive such and such portions, on account of the weight of the general evidence, and yet reject other portions, *though* sustained by the same evidence, because we think there is something unreasonable or revolting in their substance, is plainly to accept evidence only where it *pleases* us, and to reject it where it *pleases* us not. The only question fairly at issue must ever be, whether the general evidence for Christianity will overbear the difficulties which we cannot separate from the truths. If it will not, we must reject it wholly; and if it will, we must receive it wholly. There is plainly no tenable position between absolute infidelity and absolute belief.'—pp. 344–6.

'Nor will the theory of what some call "the intuitional consciousness"

Digitized by Google

ness" avail us here,' etc. etc. (p. 346). 'We cannot but judge, then, the principles of Rationalism to be logically untenable. . . . . Not wholly . . . . nor even principally for these reasons; but for the still stronger reason that such a system of objections is an egregious trifling with that great complex mass of evidence which, as we have said, applies to the *whole* of Christianity or to *none* of it. As if to baffle the efforts of man consistently to disengage these elements of our belief, the whole are inextricably blended together.'—pp. 347-8.

'Though we frankly concede that we have not *yet* seen any account of the whole first chapter of Genesis which quadrates with the doctrines of Geology, it does not become us hastily to conclude that there can be none. If a further adjustment of these doctrines, and a more diligent investigation of the Scripture, together, should hereafter *suggest* any *possible* harmony—though not the *true* one, but one ever so gratuitously assumed—it will be sufficient to neutralize the objection. This is in accordance with what has already been shown—that wherever an objection is founded on an apparent contradiction between two statements, it is sufficient to show any *possible* way in which the statements may be reconciled, whether the true one or not.'—p. 352.

'An advocate of plenary inspiration may contend that, though he does not believe that the very words of Scripture were dictated by God, yet that the thoughts were either so suggested (if the matter was such as could be known only by revelation), or so controlled (if the matter were such as was previously known), that (excluding errors introduced into the text since) the Scriptures at first composed were —what no book of man ever was, or can be, even in the plainest narrative of the simplest events—a perfectly accurate expression of truth.' —p. 346. note.

[2.] Now, in the first place, we observe that we have here a full admission, that 'errors have been introduced' into the Scriptures—that discrepancies, 'not merely apparent but real,' both as between Scripture and Scripture, and as between Scripture and physical facts, are found in the Bible, and that 'no candid advocate' can deny the existence of discrepancies—that there are in it things which, to a well-disposed believer, desirous to retain his faith, may 'seem palpably ill-reasoned, distasteful, inconsistent, or immoral:' and if they may *seem* so to any intelligent person of the kind, they can scarcely fail to be so, since these are matters wholly human, and within man's competency to judge of. This, or any part of this, is, as we have said, all we require in order to the establishing of our theory: and we think we may be allowed to put this admission, coming as it does from an able advocate of the opposite hypothesis, in the place of any laboured proof of these points, such as would otherwise be necessary in order to the application of the principles we have laid down.

[3.] The great fallacy which we shall first notice, and it is one which runs through the whole of this argument, consists in attributing

Digitized by Google

attributing objections to 'the proof,' which do in reality, on the plenary hypothesis, lie against 'the thing to be proved.'

i. We suppose there can be no doubt, from the whole of the writer's argument, from the way in which he replies to objections, and especially from what he says about inspiration, that he holds the plenary theory, although he is not led to speak very decisively on the point. But if it be not so, inasmuch as we have reason to know that his argument is highly approved by those who do hold it, and is adopted by them as a complete defence of their views, we may treat it as the argument of the plenary theorists generally: and this mode of regarding it will have the advantage of relieving our observations of a specially personal character.

The argument commences with the drawing of a distinction between 'the objections . . . . which are directed against the evidence itself, and that which it substantiates.' Now, what is the thing to be substantiated? Surely that, whatever it be, for which a special Divine origin, authority, or authentication is claimed: whatever is asserted to have in it anything preternatural. And this, on the plenary theory, is the entire Scriptures. If the whole Bible, and every chapter and verse in it be affirmed to have been given by Inspiration of God (or by his 'suggestion' or 'control,' as this writer says), then a Divine origin or authentication is predicated of every verse; and consequently every verse forms a part of that which needs to be substantiated. In fact, the plenary theory constitutes every sentence a portion of Christianity; for it maintains it to be a doctrine of Christianity that the Holy Ghost guided the Apostles into 'all truth' on all subjects, and that 'every Scripture (in the sense of every text) was given by inspiration of God.' Hence it appears competent to the infidel to urge every objection he can raise, as against Christianity itself; and incumbent on the plenary theorist to refute it, as a subversion of an essential Christian doctrine. And this is virtually recognized on both sides by their practice. Proceeding on the plenary view, Dr. Olinthus Gregory says, 'To deny Inspiration is tantamount to affirming there is no Revelation.' Now this can be asserted only on the ground that the doctrine of Inspiration is an essential part of the Revelation; for a Revelation may obviously be made and conveyed without any Inspiration of its communicators at all. 'Discrepancies,' therefore, on this theory, must be assigned to the category of 'that which is to be substantiated,' and not treated as objections against 'the evidence.' But if not, and they may be legitimately deemed objections against the evidence, then the historical and other statements against which many of them are alleged, form part of the evidences of Christianity — of the supernaturally-revealed system of doctrines. Can this be asserted? Can it be asserted

Digitized by Google

asserted of the whole of such statements, as, for instance, of the account of the Creation, of the antediluvian races, of the universal deluge, and of the chronology which ties down the duration of the human race to less than 6000 years? Can it be meant to say that those parts which, on the whole, present objections and difficulties, such as (this writer being judge) can be received only on the ground that they are borne down by preponderating affirmative testimonies, are nevertheless a portion of the evidences of the Christian scheme! Supposing physical, chronological, historical, or any other statements or allusions of the like nature, occurring in any ordinary work to be perfectly consistent with truth, even then they cannot bear witness to themselves, nor prove their own truth, albeit never so true. They none the less need to be substantiated by external evidence—either by the ascertained credibility of the author of them, or by their being borne out by other testimonies, or by experience or observation. Nay, it may obviously happen that true statements may appear so highly improbable in themselves, or be so inconsistent with a number of other accounts, or with the then existing knowledge of nature, that they will rightly be rejected. So far are even true accounts from carrying conviction with them necessarily. And if true and self-consistent statements need extrinsic testimony of some kind to obtain credence for them, or at least to deserve more than that otiose assent which we yield to unimportant propositions, and to those with regard to which the most that can be said is that we know nothing to the contrary, how much less can statements inconsistent, or self-contradictory, or disprovable from History or Physical facts be received when wholly destitute of external evidence! How illogical to class such under the head of 'the evidence itself of the Revelation κατ' ἐξοχήν'! And how immensely is the fallacy increased when it is taken into the account that for these very passages Inspiration is claimed. This then becomes the proposition:—Unsupported statements, being apparently if not really self-contradictory, mutually inconsistent, or proved to be erroneous by facts or testimonies, are not only given by Inspiration of God, but are evidences of their own truth and inspiration!!! If real discrepancies be admitted, and at the same time plenary Inspiration be claimed for the Scriptures, this would seem to be the inevitable consequence of classifying these discrepant passages under the head of 'the evidence of the truth of Christianity.'

In our view, the question of 'the proof' and 'the thing to be proved' stands thus. The records of Christianity contain two elements—the one human, the other Divine. Each of these needs to be substantiated separately and in order by its proper evidences—first, the human, by the ordinary testimonies and indications of truthfulness,

Digitized by Google

truthfulness, and then the Divine by supernatural attestations. A purely-human element of testimony is indispensably necessary to form the groundwork of the evidence of the Divine. For we need, in the first instance, to have the credibility of the Writers, as ordinary historians, clearly established; and the evidence necessary to prove this we can have only on the hypothesis that they were left wholly to themselves in their narratives of events, and of such branches of knowledge as are the proper subjects of human tradition, research, and discovery. If they were controlled by any influence from without, their testimony would be taken out of the category of that of which we are able to form an estimate. It would cease to be human testimony. It would be, more or less in proportion to the assumed extent of that influence, deprived of the 'internal marks of artlessness, truth, and sincerity;' and if that influence were Divine, it is difficult to understand how it could leave any of those inaccuracies, defects, and apparent incongruities which characterise the truest human testimony. And so an able writer says—'Inspiration secures us from the mistakes, not from the falsehood of the writers: it does not confirm their veracity, for that must be previously established; it only implies their accuracy.' It is only when witnesses are left entirely to themselves in their narrations of facts and events,—unprompted and unassisted even by human, and much more by Divine co-operation, that they can present to us such independent human testimony, as may give out those features of truth or falsehood, from which we may satisfy ourselves of their general veracity, competency, and trustworthiness, or the contrary. When, from their own unassisted statements, we have been enabled to satisfy ourselves of the degree of credit that is due to them, we may then, but not till then, receive their testimony to those miraculous facts which form the proper and alone-sufficient proof of their claim to have received an immediate Revelation from God, together with a commission to communicate it under the Inspiration of His Spirit. Thus the proof of the supernatural Revelation and Inspiration of the message is the working of supernatural works, and the proof of the supernatural works is the ascertained credibility of the witnesses, and the proof of the credibility of the witnesses depends entirely on the marks of veracity and competency discernible in their own proper statements. Whatever, therefore, effaces those marks, saps the foundation and subverts 'the whole fabric of evidence.' But the plenary theory does this. It eliminates all exclusively-human testimony, declaring that there is no sentence in the Bible but what was written by 'the suggestion' or 'under the control' of the Divine Spirit. It removes the whole from the category of 'the proofs' to that of the things to be proved;' and would seem to leave itself only a vicious

Digitized by Google circle

circle to run round, proving the external supernatural facts (for it has left them destitute of all other proof), by the internal supernatural influence, and, on the other hand, the Inspiration by the miracles.

The necessity of the adoption of the above order in the argument is fully recognized by Divines. Benson, for instance, lays it down in his 'Hulsean Lectures,' in 1820. But how he can at one time speak of the Apostles as plenarily inspired, '*even infallible historians*,' and at another treat them 'merely as men of fidelity and truth;' or upon what principle the same 'substantial truths of the Gospels' may, for the purpose of one argument, be 'considered only as human compositions,' and then again, to serve the purpose of another, be regarded as Divine, we are at a loss to understand. The same passages cannot surely be at once inspired and uninspired, human and Divine; and thus to use them does indeed appear to us to be 'playing fast and loose' with the evidence. Yet Gaussen does not shrink from the paradoxical assertion that 'the Scripture is entirely the word of man, and it is also wholly the Word of God' (p. 304); which is even more absurd than to affirm that A having written a history abounding with mistakes and inaccuracies, which B had corrected, the work given to the public was wholly the composition of A, and also wholly that of B.[h]

If, now, we have succeeded in showing that the plenary theory

[h] We may here take occasion to show by a few brief extracts from *Theopneustia* to what an extreme the universal-plenary theory of inspiration is carried by many. 'The divinity of all parts of Scripture depends on their being found in the book of the oracles of God' (p. vii.). Inspiration extends to all subjects and all details' (pp. 25–26, 252). 'The Scriptures are from God; they are in every part of God, and they are as a whole entirely from God' (p. 30). 'They contain no error, either important or unimportant, positive or negative' (p. 302). 'Their entire contents are inspired by God' (p. 36), *even to the least iota and particle of a letter*' (p. 78, 427). 'If there were parts of the Bible without inspiration, it would no longer be the truth to say that the whole Bible is divinely-inspired' (p. 54). '*We fully admit that if any physical errors could be proved to exist in Sacred Writ, it would not be a book from God*' (p. 171, 182, 192). 'That a chapter or a word is part of the Scriptures, should suffice to prove it divinely good' (p. 254). 'Belief in the inspiration of the thoughts might be dispensed with; whilst we may not dispense with the belief of that of the language.' 'If the thoughts only are supplied to him, and the words be not, it is not a Bible which he gives me. it is little more than a sermon' (p. 304, 381). 'There is only one degree of inspiration, viz. suggestion' (p. 312, 324). 'Hence all the writers are equally inspired, and that by an organic inspiration' (p. 335).

It will be seen that we have not dealt only with this verbal theory; in fact we have given our opponents the widest scope of the term plenary. We have given latitude enough to comprehend even more moderate advocates of it than Henderson, who says that 'no part of the Bible was written without *miraculous* influence; that all parts were equally inspired; and that in regard to *the most minute and inconsiderable things* which the Scripture contains, we are compelled to say, This also cometh from the Lord;' or, again, than Professor Woods, who affirms, that 'Each and every part of what was written was divinely inspired, and equally so, and clothed with Divine authority.'

Digitized by Google

has the effect of transferring all the historical statements of Scripture from 'the proof' to 'the thing to be proved,' it will follow that the whole of the argument which treats internal discrepancies as a part of the external evidences is, as proceeding from a plenary theorist, entirely misplaced and futile. For such an one to speak as though it were possible that objections against that which is to him 'the thing to be proved' could 'leave the whole fabric of proof in ruins,' is obviously illogical. Whatever might be the number and weight of the objections, they could not come nigh or affect the proof. And this, not only because they are transferred to a different class and occupy a different position, but, specially in this case, because they are really of a different nature—the one being historical and natural, while the other is physical and supernatural. Such objections might possibly shatter the whole internal fabric to pieces—that is to say, they may subvert the plenary theory, remove much from the domain claimed for Revelation to that which belongs to fallible history; but they will, after all, leave the evidence wholly untouched, to depend upon and be tried by its own peculiar laws;—nay, they will have the effect of restoring the evidence to its proper place, and to the relations essential to its validity.

We cannot, therefore, agree with this writer in thinking that 'the principles of Rationalism are logically untenable, chiefly because such a system of objections is an egregious trifling with that great complex mass of evidence which applies to the whole of Christianity or to none of it.' Granting that the evidence of Christianity applies 'to the whole or to none of it,' it does not follow that the objections alluded to are directed against its proper proofs, still less that they affect Christianity itself; since they *may* be (and, as *we* contend, they are, generally speaking) alleged against that which forms no part of Christianity, nor any portion of its evidence but what is fairly open to such objections. But if indeed the whole contents of the Scriptures are so 'inextricably blended together' as to make it impossible to disengage them, and if 'the supernatural element of inspiration' is so diffused through all the records, that it is more and more felt at every step to be impossible to obliterate it in any part without obliterating it altogether, and hence every portion and subject contained in them must be regarded as forming a part of Christianity, then the objections lie against Christianity itself, rather than against its evidence — with which they only indirectly come in contact by raising a presumption or proof that the former could not have come from God. On this assumption, indeed, it becomes indirectly a series of contests between the evidence and every separate objection, on each of which

Digitized by Google

which the reception or rejection of Christianity ought logically to be made dependent; since to stamp palpable error on one single statement claiming to be given by inspiration of God, and forming an inseparable portion of the whole Revelation, must be enough to refute the claim *in toto*. We must leave to others to fight the battle on this ground, being of opinion that it must inevitably end in the triumph of the infidel. On the ground we take of the possibility of distinguishing between subjects, (but without the aid of the 'intuitional consciousness,') the subject-matter, against which the objections adverted to are alleged, is removed out of the sphere of inspiration, and consequently 'the evidence for Christianity' can never come into competition in any way or shape with 'difficulties' thence arising. On the contrary, many of those very difficulties may be said in part to sustain the evidence by giving it the characteristic features of human testimony. And such being the case, it is manifestly a gratuitous assumption to assert that 'there is plainly no tenable position between absolute infidelity and absolute belief.' And this writer's argument on this point may, even more justly than the principles of Rationalism, be adjudged 'logically untenable.'

It will be evident from what has now been said that this is a question which, when a distinction is drawn between 'the evidence' and 'that which it substantiates,' does not, on the plenary hypothesis, so much relate to the former as to the latter. Yet the latter is formally treated of by this writer only in a single sentence, containing the substance of Bishop Butler's argument. And, strange to say, he claims the shelter of the Bishop's authority, where it is in a great measure afforded to those who are opposed to his theory. He makes the Bishop to affirm that objections against the essential truths of Christianity are 'perfectly frivolous,' unless they be truly such as prove contradictions in them. But the Bishop is not speaking of these exclusively. He makes, indeed, the distinction, which the author of this article has adopted from him, of 'objections against Christianity as distinguished from objections against its evidence.' But then under the former head he includes to some extent those objections, which this writer (probably from want of attention to the wide sense in which Butler uses the term Christianity) has transferred to the latter. This will be evident from the following extract from the beginning of the chapter referred to:—

'*Besides* the objections *against the evidence* for Christianity, many are alleged against the scheme of it;—against the whole manner in which it is put and left with the world; *as well as against several particular relations in Scripture*: objections drawn from the deficiencies of Revelation; from things in it appearing to men foolishness;

Digitized by Google

ness; from its containing matters of offence . . . . . ; from its not being universal; and . . . . from its evidence not being so convincing . . . . as it might have been . . . . It would be tedious, indeed impossible, to enumerate the several particulars comprehended under the objections here referred to.'—*Analogy*, Part II., ch. iii.

Hence it would appear that Butler included under his second class of objections, not merely those against the religious system of Christianity (as this writer has supposed), but those also relating to the contents of the Scriptures generally, and to particular difficulties in it. And it is the latter chiefly, if not exclusively (as appears from what follows, particularly where he says, 'Therefore neither obscurity, nor seeming inaccuracy of style, nor various readings, nor disputes about the authors, nor thoughts of the like kind, could overthrow the authority of the Scripture') that he has in view, when he asserts that *objections against Christianity itself are in a great measure frivolous.*'

This writer, then, has not claimed the authority of Bishop Butler, where alone it is certain that he might have done so; and he has claimed it where it is not certain that he has the Bishop with him. And as to the classification of objections, it would seem that the Bishop does not go with him but with us in considering that, from the plenary point of view, there should be comprehended under the class of objections against Christianity, or 'the thing to be substantiated,' every kind of objections not immediately directed against the external evidences.

Let us look now at 'that which is to be substantiated' according to the writer in the Edinburgh. It is that 'system,' with regard to which we 'cannot be competent judges, either as to what it is worthy of the Supreme Mind to reveal, or how far a portion may harmonize with the whole.'

ii. Very many portions of the Scriptures, then, are excluded—even all those relating to matters of History, Chronology, Genealogy, private affairs, and the like, which cannot be shown to form any part of such a system, nor many of them to have any imaginable connection with, or bearing upon it. It is to no purpose to say that these may form a portion of the system, though we are unable to point out the connection. This '*may be*' is a very convenient resource in failure of all other kind of argument, but it must not be allowed to supply the place of all proof. In this instance, as in every other, we ought to be governed by *probabilities*, not by *possibilities*. 'To us,' as Butler says, 'probability is the very guide of life.' And it is scarcely to be thought possible that any intelligent person who has not determined to lay aside the use of reason altogether in this matter, can entertain a doubt in the majority of instances, whether it were probable—nay, we

Digitized by Google may

may say, whether it were possible that this or that particular was worthy of God to reveal, or formed a portion—we do not say *harmonizing* with the whole, for this is nothing to the purpose, since it might harmonize therewith, and not be a part, or might appear not to harmonize, and yet be a part—but even formed a portion of the system at all. And if it be true that, with regard to some instances, we 'cannot be competent judges,' 'what is the just consequence?—Not,' as Butler rightly observes, 'that reason is no judge of what is offered to us as being of divine revelation. For this would be to infer that we are unable to judge of anything, because we are unable to judge of all things. Reason can, and it ought to judge, not only of the meaning, but also of the morality and evidence of revelation.'—If, then, it may judge on points which are of the essence of Revelation, or on which its reception, or right reception, wholly depends, how much more on matters comparatively insignificant, and which do at least *appear* to have no connection whatever with Revelation? It seems to be thought sufficient to dispose of the question touching these to say, 'The evidence which *sustains*[1] Christianity is all such as man is competent to consider; while the objections are founded entirely on ignorance and presumption.' (*Edin. Rev.*, p. 322.) This is a bold assertion, indeed, to make in so sweeping a form, and to leave wholly unsubstantiated. It is not universally true of those objections, with which we have here no concern; and it is obviously untrue of those with which we have. For, in reference to the latter, will any one maintain that we must be more 'ignorant' and 'incompetent' to judge on Historical and similar questions, and the evidence that accredits them, than on Miracles and Prophecies, and their evidence? will any one contend that it must be 'presumptuous' in us to judge of things occurring in the ordinary course of nature, but not so of those which are deviations from it?

This writer then excludes from that which is to be substantiated all merely secular matters, by his account of what is to be substantiated, as much as by his treating objections relating to these as not being objections against the thing to be proved. And what is the result? Why, that he virtually concedes the soundness of our theory. For these are the things which, *we* contend, were not given by inspiration of God; and *he* admits, with regard to them, that they are not proved by the evidence, and further implies that they do not even form a part of 'the thing to be proved' as of Divine revelation or inspiration.

iii. From showing what he does not include, we proceed to

[1] The italics are found in the Review.

scrutinize

Digitized by Google

scrutinize his statements in reference to that which he does include in 'the thing to be substantiated.' He adopts substantially the sentiments of the venerable author of the Analogy with regard to man's competence to judge of what God has revealed or may reveal. We shall therefore advert chiefly to the work of the latter. We may well expect indeed that in venturing to call in question the reasoning of so celebrated a writer, we shall be esteemed by many guilty of a presumption second only to that of impugning the testimony of Scripture,—especially when we impute a fallacy which runs, we fear, through the greater part of the argument of the Analogy and is fatal to it. But we should deem it treachery to truth to allow the fear of any charge of the kind to induce us to withhold our sentiments, seeing that the exposition of them can tend only to the elucidation of truth, though it be but in the way that the sun's bright orb appears to receive increased brilliancy by the transit of a dark cloud across his disk. At the same time, it is with the utmost diffidence that we venture to impugn the reasoning of a work so celebrated for the power of its argument.

Bishop Butler's work is founded on, or designed to exhibit 'The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature.' In the chapter above referred to, and which the writer in the Edinburgh has in view throughout, occur the following passages:—

'Upon supposition of a revelation, it is highly credible beforehand that we should be incompetent judges of it to a great degree: and that it would contain many things appearing to us liable to great objections in case we judge of it otherwise than by the analogy of nature.' Hence, 'objections against Christianity, as distinguished from objections against its evidence, are frivolous.'

'If the natural and revealed dispensation of things are both from God, if they coincide with each other, and together make up one scheme of Providence; our being incompetent judges of one must render it credible that we may be incompetent judges also of the other. Since . . . the course of nature is . . . different from what . . . would have been expected; and such as, men fancy, there lie great objections against: this renders it beforehand highly credible, that they may find the revealed dispensation likewise, if they judge of it as they do of the constitution of nature, very different from expectations formed beforehand; and liable in appearance to great objections.'

'These observations, relating to the whole of Christianity, are applicable to inspiration in particular. As we are in no sort judges beforehand, by what laws or rules, in what degree or by what means it were to have been expected that God would *naturally* instruct us; so upon supposition of his affording us instruction by revelation, . . . we are in no sort judges, by what methods and in what proportion it were to be

Digitized by Google

be expected that this *supernatural* instruction would be afforded us.' . . . 'It is highly credible beforehand that . . . it would be with circumstances, in manners, degrees, and respects, which we should be apt to fancy we had great objections against the credibility of.'

Now, to the whole foundation and superstructure of the Bishop's argument we most respectfully demur. We doubt whether any real analogy subsists between Religion and the constitution and course of Nature.

Take, first, Natural Religion. What does Butler mean by this phrase? Certainly not that which Dwight intends by it, namely, 'the religion of beings placed under law only;' but 'the religion which we derive, or are supposed to be able to derive, from the constitution and course of nature.' The latter then is the source, and the former the thing derived from that source:—the one is in the position of premiss, the other of the inference from it; the one stands to the other in the relation of cause to effect. How then can an analogy exist between them?—If, indeed, we ought not rather, on the contrary, to say, How can it fail to do so? If difficulties insoluble by us are met with in *the sources* of our knowledge, will not corresponding defects naturally and necessarily enter into *the knowledge* thence derived? To insist on this fact, is it not to make much ado about a truism? Or does it remove or diminish any difficulty, having its origin doubtless in our finite capacities, to allege that the same finite capacity finds the same or a similar difficulty in its inquiries into the course and constitution of nature?

To say that we meet with such and such difficulties in nature, and therefore we may reasonably expect to find the same in the religion of nature, is what no one will question—nay, it will readily be admitted that we certainly shall meet with such. But this amounts to nothing. The point on which every thing turns,—supposing it to be an instance in which it is clear that the religious difficulty is not caused by a natural difficulty, is to show a parallelism (and it must be a real and independent parallelism) between the two, by proving that the former, like the latter, does really lie without the sphere of our knowledge and power to judge. It is fallacious to argue that an objection against a doctrine of religion is shown to be frivolous and of no weight, if any objection, more or less similar, against the doctrines we have received respecting the course and constitution of nature can be adduced, which is therein admitted not to be conclusive; unless it can further be shown, both that the religious objection does not *necessarily* attend the derivation of the doctrine (owing to deficiency in our knowledge of nature), and also that the religious doctrine lies as certainly beyond our competency to judge as the natural. If either

Digitized by Google

either of these cannot be proved, the argument from analogy does not hold good:—if the former cannot, identity and not analogy exists; if the latter, diversity and not parallelism.

Here we apprehend lies a defect in Butler's argument under this head. And it fails chiefly on the former account. If we recollect right, his arguments to establish analogy are identical with those, or some of those, which are advanced to prove the doctrines of natural religion. Hence they constitute the positive proof; and it cannot be legitimate to reproduce them in another capacity (as though they were distinct and independent testimonies), for the purpose of obviating objections to the evidence, of which in truth they themselves form a part. But as this division of his work does not properly come within the scope of this paper, we must pass on to that which has an important bearing on our present subject,—the analogy between Nature and Revealed Religion.

It may be fully admitted, not only that we could not be *competent* judges *beforehand* what would be the nature, character, or contents of any Revelation that God might be pleased to make to man, but that we could not be judges of these in the smallest degree:—not only is it credible but absolutely certain, on the ground that God does nothing needlessly, and also on account of the infinite superiority of the Divine Attributes over the human, that man would be utterly unable to anticipate or remotely to conjecture what kind of scheme would have been framed in the counsels of the Almighty from all eternity,—'by what laws or rules, in what degree or by what means,' how or when, he would have determined to instruct mankind. But this is a very different thing, it will be observed, from his being able to judge of a Revelation when it has been revealed;—of its consistency with God's actings in Nature and Providence, so far as these are known to him;—or of its consistency with infinite knowledge, wisdom, goodness, and truth;—or of one part with another, that is, of its self-consistency. Of these he can, may, and must judge in the case of any system which claims to be a Revelation from God. And we cannot agree with Origen (from whose saying Butler appears to have taken the idea of his work), that 'he may well expect to find the same sort of difficulties' in a Revelation, 'as are found in the constitution of Nature;' nor that objections thence arising can be obviated on the ground of an analogy in nature. And the reason one would think to be obvious, namely, that the one is not a revelation, and the other is professedly such. We have no ground whatever for supposing that God *designed* to make Himself and His ways known to man by means of his works in nature: nor can any such design be inferred from the fact that certain of 'His

Digitized by Google

'His invisible things, even His eternal power and Godhead, are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things that are made.' Such things are very few, including only His existence, power, wisdom, and goodness: and they cannot prove, nor even indicate any *intention* to reveal Himself; since they appear to be incidental,—if we may not say, unavoidable manifestations. With more apparent reason we may say that God in His actings in nature rather sought to shroud Himself and His ways from mortal ken. That we are not able to discover more of Him from His works, and that the little we can learn from them is so full of uncertainty and difficulties, are strong indications of this. Some presumption in favour of the same view also arises from the fact of a Revelation. If such were contemplated in the Divine counsels, it is more likely than not that a greater glory would be given to it by contrast with a previously-enhanced darkness. So that we may well believe that 'clouds and darkness' were made purposely to obscure His face in nature. And if so,—or if only He had no regard to man's knowing Him when He created the Universe and gave it laws, it is no wonder that man should be unable 'by searching to find out the Almighty:'—on the contrary, it would be certain that such would be the case, and that he would meet with difficulties and stumbling blocks at every step of his inquiry.

Not so with Revelation.—The very object of this being to make God and His ways known to a certain extent, we may assuredly infer that within the limits proposed every thing would be made as clear, and rendered as free from difficulties as it would be possible for God, having to deal with human faculties and human language without departing from the law of economy, to render it. There is therefore no analogy between God's dealings in Nature and in Revelation: the difference in design destroys it. And so far from a presumption existing that what we meet with in the one we may expect to find in the other, the presumption lies the other way. We may reasonably expect to be competent to judge of that which *God* reveals much more than of that which *man* communicates; because infinite wisdom is engaged in making it plain. And if we cannot, it falls short of being a *Revelation:* and in so far as we cannot, we may presume that the inspiration of God did not extend. It is nothing to the purpose to say that we cannot comprehend the Divine scheme in all its fulness and in all its possible bearings. Whatever we cannot comprehend is no part of the Revelation to us: it is not a thing *revealed;* it is a thing so far hidden. But indeed this objection has no application to the particular case with which we have to do, as we shall show when we come to speak of the Christian Revelation in particular.

At

Digitized by Google

At present we shall aim to elucidate and confirm our view by adopting the illustration which Bishop Butler introduces for the same purpose. It will only be necessary to make it conformable to the obvious contingencies of the case, and it will then, we venture to think, be seen at once to establish our view and exclude Butler's. For he wholly omits the intention of the Prince, upon which every thing depends, and thus destroys all parallelism.

Suppose then, first, that a Prince governs his remote dominions in the wisest manner possible, but without any reference to his subjects,—we mean, without any design either to make known to, or to conceal from them his character or the principles on which he acts. Suppose him, secondly, to govern with equal wisdom, but with the express object of concealing the principles and plans of his government from his subjects, either as a judicial punishment for some infraction of His laws and rebellion against himself, or with the view to humble them and to exhibit ultimately the excellency of his wisdom in a more striking point of view. Suppose him, thirdly, after governing for a long period in conformity with the first hypothesis, suddenly to make a change in certain of his laws, suspending some wholly or partially, directly contravening others, and introducing some unknown before; but making these alterations without any reference to the enlightenment of his subjects. Suppose him, fourthly, to depart from the first or second hypothetical modes of government for the express purpose of exhibiting the wisdom and beneficence of his government to his subjects, and making these as plain as possible even to the meanest of them. On all these suppositions the degree of knowledge obtainable by the subjects would be in direct proportion to their capacities as compared with that of the Prince. Hence, on the first hypothesis, if they were greatly inferior to him in knowledge and abilities, it would be likely beforehand that they would obtain little or no insight into his procedure, and be greatly perplexed with difficulties and apparent inconsistencies:—on the second, that they would be baffled in every attempt to search out his ways, which would seem to them more or less a chaos of incongruities:—on the third, that any discoveries they might have obtained under the first system would appear contradicted, and they would deem it vain 'to judge of the wisdom of the extra-ordinary administration,' when they had had experience how little they could 'judge of that of the ordinary:'—on the fourth, a fulness of light would break upon them proportionate to the wisdom and beneficence of the system and the means taken to elucidate these.

Now, to apply these several hypotheses. The first and third form Butler's illustration, and in the inference he draws it will be seen that we fully agree. The infinite God being the Sovereign, and

Digitized by Google

and finite beings the subjects, so far from being 'competent judges of the common rules of his government,' it were to be expected that they would be able to learn infinitely little about them, and still less to judge 'in what exigencies, or in what manner, or to what degree, those laws would be' changed; and that when they were changed, they would be even more likely than before to think that they had objections against them, and would be less able to obviate the objections. But this illustration does not meet the case of a Revelation. For, on the one hand, it cannot be proved (to say the least) that 'the course and constitution of nature,' as governed by the laws of Divine Providence, were framed with a view to the communication of *any* knowledge of the Deity to man, while the mere designation of 'a *revelation*' not only implies, but expressly asserts that this was *the very object* of the interposition. Still less is it 'applicable,' as Butler asserts, 'to the whole of Christianity, and to Inspiration in particular.' For the immense expenditure of means for the attainment of this object in the case of the Christian Revelation renders this illustration *peculiarly inapplicable* to it.

It cannot but be obvious that the second and fourth hypotheses afford the true illustration in the case before us. They alone present parallelisms to the probable, if we may not say proved, ends of the Deity in His natural and revealed 'administrations.' If, then, the degree of the darkness and of the light respectively, under the two 'dispensations,' may rightly be expected to be proportionate to the power of the Supreme Ruler to produce each, then, under nature and the religious light of nature, a more than Egyptian darkness might be anticipated,—an obscured vision of but 'the back parts,'—the hem of the garment only of the Deity, and that marred by many rents and stains: whereas under the revealed economy a full blaze of light, shining with the utmost splendour that the nature of the recipients could endure,—'a light that would lighten the most distant nations,' make clear to the dullest minds, and leave no dark spots unilluminated,—may certainly be looked for. Thus we have presented to us a mutual antagonism instead of an analogy between the natural and revealed dispensations. And if it be thought that the design to conceal is not sufficiently apparent in the administration of nature, let our first hypothesis be substituted for the second. Our argument will remain unaffected. The antagonism on the one side will alone be eliminated. But this reduction in the contrast will be much more than compensated on the other side, when the means employed to make 'the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven' clear and comprehensible are taken into account. These are not represented in the illustration made use of, in which a change of system is alone supposed. But in the actual

Digitized by Google

actual instance of Christianity they throw an immense weight into our scale. We find therein not a mere change in the religious system, but also a multiplicity of provisions for the elucidation of it. First, a complex course of preparation carried on during a long series of ages; which exhibited, negatively, what was *not* the scheme devised in the counsels of the Almighty, and positively, but through a veil which was gradually rendered less opaque as the appointed time drew nigh, what *was* the nature of the system to be introduced. Then we have a full exposition of the subject-matter of the revelation set forth as being so plain that 'he may run that readeth it;' and this exposition is conveyed through men the most illiterate and dull of understanding, as though for the express purpose of bringing it down to the level of the meanest capacity; and at any rate proving that, if *they* were competent to comprehend and judge of it, any others may be so too. But, above all, the Sovereign Himself, 'the fellow of the Almighty,' is set forth as appearing in the nature and character of one of the meanest subjects; one purpose of his doing so being that he might be able (by acquiring the power of speaking in His subjects' language,—of entering into their feelings and sympathising with their infirmities,—and of conversing with them face to face) to expound to them fully the scheme He then introduced and the laws He had enacted; while at the same time He exhibited for their better guidance a perfect pattern of what a subject living under the system He introduced ought to be. A revelation thus made cannot, with a shadow of reason or probability, be expected beforehand to be liable to 'many insoluble objections,' nor indeed does it appear reasonable to anticipate, or even to admit, the existence of a single objection of this nature—we mean of an objection lying within the scope of the *revealed* system being *really insoluble*, or of which a probable solution cannot be offered. It is nothing to the purpose to say, that we cannot be 'competent judges how far a portion of an imperfectly-developed system may harmonise with the whole.' The Christian system *is* perfectly developed—the revelation of it is completed. Nor again, that 'perhaps on many points we never can be competent judges, unless we can cease to be finite.' Admit it, and what then? 'Many' is not 'all.' Nor does it amount to anything to say in general that we are not 'competent judges,' or that everything is not fully comprehensible by us. It must be proved that this may be said with truth of the particular case against which the objection is made, and which it is sought to relieve from it on this ground. It must be shown what points there are really included in the revealed system and obnoxious to objections, of which it may be affirmed that they extend beyond the reach of finite capacities, and that the difficulty may arise from that

Digitized by Google

that cause. And if such there be, it will still not affect *our* position, unless it can be shown (which it cannot) that points of history, chronology, and the like, may be of this nature. So also, though we may not be competent to judge in *every* case what 'it is worthy of the Supreme mind to reveal,' it does not follow that we can be competent to judge in *no* case, or not in the great *majority* of cases.

On the whole, we think we are justified in reversing the saying of Butler, and affirming that 'if a man were *not* a judge of the wisdom of the ordinary administration of God, there is reason to think that he *would be* a judge of the wisdom of the extra-ordinary,' if its object were to reveal God and his dealings: and that 'there is much more ground to expect that the latter should appear to us clear of objections than that the former should.'

And the inference we would draw is, that if there be, as we think we have shown that there is, the highest presumption that the subject-matter of any special revelation would be brought within the range of man's judgment, and be free from any material difficulties, or liability to weighty objections, and that the mode and circumstances of the Christian revelation greatly enhance this presumption in its case, we have the strongest reason for believing that any subjects treated of, or parts contained in the records of such revelation, as to which there exist objections of whatever kind, whether relating to physical or historical errors, self-contradictions, illogical reasonings, or things in which it were obviously *not* worthy of God to guide or dictate to the writer, formed no portion or no essential portions of the revelation, nor was written under the inspiration of God.

iv. Another point on which this writer lays great stress, and which, indeed, is essential to his whole argument, is, that a wide distinction, a separation as far as the east is from the west, must be made between 'minute' and 'immaterial,' and 'material' and 'vital points.' Now we contend that an utter fallacy lies here. No such distinction can be admitted so long as inspiration is claimed for these points. Nothing is 'material,' and nothing 'immaterial,' in the sight of God. A 'minute' error is as impossible to Him as a 'vital' one. A small discrepancy no more than a large one can enter into anything that proceeds from Him. The above are wholly relative terms, and proper only to a finite being. He, therefore, who would avail himself of this distinction must first descend from the high ground of inspiration, on which he claims Divine authentication and authority; and in so doing he will take his stand on the same level with ourselves.

v. We proceed to notice another fallacy in the paper in the *Edinburgh*, which we conceive to be even more fatal to the argument

Digitized by Google

ment than that above adverted to, namely, *the want of distinguishing between the characteristics of inspired and uninspired writings.*

The writer complains that 'objectors are slow to admit modes of reconciliation in the case of the sacred narratives,' which they readily accept in other histories, and he finds fault with 'the *advocates* of Christianity for being reluctant to allow that there are real discrepancies in the Scriptures.' One would have thought that a general consent thus yielded on both sides, by apologists as well as by objectors, would have sufficed to lead him to see that there must be good ground for placing the two classes of writings upon a different footing. And the reason for so doing would seem obvious, namely, that there is between them the difference of finite and infinite knowledge. Uninspired writings are the productions of beings, whose characteristics may be said to be errors and short-sightedness; but inspired Scriptures are written under the 'suggestion' and 'control' of Him to whom all things past, present, and future are perfectly known. We may, therefore, as justly expect perfect immunity from all error, and even shades of error, in the latter case as we certainly expect to find it in the former. And that we cannot admit reconciliations in the one case, which we do in the other, a very little consideration will show. When an *apparent* but not real discrepancy between the statements of any writer occurs, it must arise either from want of intention or ability to communicate the whole truth known to him, or from ignorance of the whole truth on his part: a *real* discrepancy can proceed only from imperfect or false information. We may believe God not to design, or not even to be able to communicate to finite beings full information on every subject; and hence apparent discrepancies, with regard to which this may be supposed to be the case, may fairly be deemed no real objections on this ground. But this is *the only exception*, and this mode of solution will be found really applicable to very few of the objections in question: it will apply to none of those, constituting the great bulk, in which a variation in a phrase or a few additional words would have removed all the difficulty. None of those which cannot be brought within this category (and which must consequently be referred to the other, that is, be taken to proceed from imperfect or erroneous information) can possibly be solved, and inspiration be at the same time maintained, unless we can suppose infinite knowledge, wisdom, and truth, to send forth with His sanction, and with a just claim to His authentication, statements self-contradictory, false, or inaccurate in however small a degree.

It would seem most obvious, that inspired and uninspired writings do not present parallel cases. Of the former we do not hesitate to say, 'the author was inaccurately informed here, he contradicts

Digitized by Google

tradicts himself there, his statements are proved false in this particular by ascertained facts in nature, and in that by unquestionable testimonies of history.' But we cannot say this of writings which claim to have God for their author. And if it be answered that such things in the Bible have proceeded from, or been introduced by man; we reply, then they came not from God, nor were given by the inspiration of His Spirit, and consequently the whole Bible is not from God, which is the main point we contend for. Henceforth it is a question of degree, and not of principle. And we may go further, and deny that it is possible to apply this principle of subsequent corruption or introduction to very many of the real discrepancies.

Further, it is not sufficient in inspired as in uninspired statements to allege possible 'incompleteness,' as an answer to charges of discrepancies, unless it may also be alleged that some inconvenience might have arisen from 'completeness.' We cannot suppose that God would needlessly place stumbling blocks in the way of our understanding Him, while he was specially addressing us for the purpose of revelation. This would also be contravening the object for which inspiration was vouchsafed, and would be inconsistent with the design of Revelation to make plain the way of life, so that 'a way-faring man, though a fool, may not err therein.' What need, we may ask, of inspiration in the narration of facts, if it is to leave the history liable to the same deficiencies and consequent objections as it would have been liable to if it had not been written under inspiration?

We say, then, that (as we have shown above) the characteristics of those things which proceed out of the mouth of God are infallible truth, consistency, perspicuity, wisdom, supreme importance, goodness; and the sure marks of that which proceeds from man are imperfections, inaccuracies, errors, faults, discrepancies. Wherever we discern *these*, we are bound to attribute the portions or subjects in which they exist, and to such extent as they exist, to man: wherever we find *those* we may receive them as 'the Word of God.' We consider that in all subjects but one treated of in the Bible the latter are found, and the former only in that one. And hence we are enabled to draw a line between them, which may show what is and what is not given by inspiration of God.

We anticipate that the objection will immediately be made that this rule constitutes us the absolute judges of what is revealed truth, and assumes that we are competent to decide what is infallible truth, etc. But this is not really the case: it only affords us a rule of distinction, but not *the* ground of reception. The latter we derive from the Scriptures themselves, or rather from our Lord himself. He has declared to us wherein alone lies infallible truth, etc.; namely, in that into which it was to be the

Digitized by Google
mission

mission of the Comforter to guide his Apostles—'THE TRUTH.' We receive this subject, therefore, as Divine and infallible, not *on account of* the judgment we form with regard to it (though we do form that judgment), but on the authority of one whom we hold to be Himself infallible and Divine. The broad and general distinction, therefore, is drawn for us by its being determined, on the affirmative side, what *is* revealed and authenticated by God himself; while we are left to discriminate, on the negative side only, by the application of our rule, what *is not* from God, but forms a portion of that human testimony which is indispensably necessary in its proper place (as we have shown) to the substantiation of the truth itself. Whatever difficulties may arise in practically applying the rule (and we are well aware they will be many and great) they cannot invalidate it if it has been as unimpeachably established as we think it has. Nor is our view liable, with regard to that subject which we do deem inspired, to the objection made against the verbal theory, that it requires 'a perpetual series of most minute and ludicrous miracles.' Our theory binds us not to hold a greater degree of inspiration than would be necessary for the communication and safe transmission of the essentials of the Christian scheme in their integrity. 'The truth,' 'the Gospel,' everything generally necessary to salvation, might be set forth in a great variety of forms and passages, so as to be wholly independent of verbal niceties of expression, and to be quite removed beyond the bounds at which ordinary corruptions would affect it. In fact, the principle of economy on which our theory is based, requires us to presume that such a disposition would be made. This, therefore, is not only consistent with, but involved in this theory; which is more than can be said of the plenary, in which an inspiration being claimed for the whole, and that not merely of substance, matter, or idea, but extending to the enunciation and outward form of parts, as chapters, paragraphs, and verses, it is difficult to see where a line of demarcation can be drawn, and consequently how the whole can be put out of reach of danger. If inspiration governed the external form at all, we are at a loss to perceive on what ground it may be affirmed that, say twenty words, forming a sentence, were written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, but that two, four, or six might be subtracted or changed without diminution of the Word of God.

But if our distinction between the inspired and uninspired elements be deemed untenable, what must be the consequence? Seeing that inspiration is claimed for every part of the Scriptures alike, and that no real inconsistency can exist in that which is composed under the suggestion or special superintendence of Omniscience, one such inconsistency must be sufficient to outweigh any possible amount of evidence. Supposing a contrariety to be admitted

Digitized by Google

mitted or undeniable, no human testimony on the affirmative side can come near to equal the negative which the attributes of God oppose to it: and consequently the falsehood of the claim to inspiration must be held to be demonstrated. But 'real discrepancies' are admitted to exist in the Scriptures: and therefore if, as this writer says, we may not 'receive such and such portions,' and yet, 'reject other portions;' because 'the whole are inextricably blended together,' and 'there is plainly no tenable position between absolute infidelity and absolute belief,' we must necessarily be driven into absolute infidelity.

vi. We may notice, moreover, another argument, unanswerable so far as we can perceive, which the position taken by this writer affords to his opponents. 'You *complain*,' may the Rationalist say, 'that I do not extend the same liberty of reconciliation to the sacred writers as I do to profane; and you *claim* that "any—not the real, but only a hypothetical and possible; not the true, but one ever so gratuitously assumed—medium of reconciling an alleged absolute contradiction between two statements" be admitted to be "quite sufficient to remove the objection." I answer, your *complaint* is unreasonable; for it is you yourself who remove Scriptural statements from the same category by claiming for them Divine authority. Admit their non-inspiration, and we will concede the same scope for exculpation in these as in other cases; but it will never do to put Scriptural statements on a Divine footing in respect of reception and authority, and on a human footing in respect of difficulties. This were to demand the liberty of prescribing arbitrarily to your opponent the use of such arguments only as you can refute. Your *claim*, too, is no less unreasonable, so long as you refuse to extend to the infidel the same scope for the removal of difficulties. You have presented a long list of formidable difficulties in the way of infidelity. Grant that not the "real," not "the true," nor even a probable, but only a "possible and hypothetical theory" will suffice for their removal, and everything is made easy. The mountains of difficulty vanish before any one of the mythical or rationalistic theories, inconsistent and mutually exclusive though they be. It will be sufficient to be able to say that any one, or any combination of a part of them, or selection from the whole may POSSIBLY be true. And surely the infidel may claim this liberty for reconcilement with much more show of reason than the Christian advocate can. For he may allege that the cause under litigation stands at present wholly on ex-parte statements. No testimony of witnesses on his side is extant: all the evidence producible is against him. If then he can devise any theory, which, though liable to many insoluble objections, may by possibility account for the main and unquestionable facts, he has done all

Digitized by Google

that

that can be required of him consistently with the rule laid down by his opponents. For if, when by the cross-examination of the witnesses opposed to him he has exposed many discrepancies in their evidence, these are sufficiently reconciled by any possible hypothesis, much more and to a much greater extent may he, who has no witnesses, claim a similar latitude for the removal of the difficulties presented to him. Nay, the infidel may justly claim the utmost latitude that can be accorded in the case of partial, remote, and wholly adverse accounts; while the Christian advocate, who claims for his records Divine inspiration, does by that claim exclude himself altogether from this advantage.

In thus putting an argument in the mouth of a Rationalist, we are far indeed from intending to advance his cause. We leave the advocacy of that to those who have already taken up the gauntlet, evidently with an eye to the article under consideration, and whose best mode of carrying on the controversy appears to be in treating with contempt 'old dogmas about Reason and Faith,' and in patronising such writers as Froude and Foxton, encouraging them not to 'stand abashed by sneers at their youth and incompetency,'[k]—an encouragement, by the way, which these writers (judging from their works) seem little enough to need. But it is because we believe the position taken by the able writer in the Edinburgh to be unsound, and the principle he lays down capable of being thus turned against him with damaging effect, that we have endeavoured to show that it is a two-edged sword, cutting both ways, and more effectually against than for him. And this the more, because the Rationalist can, by this writer's own admission, adduce an almost universal consent of the advocates of his theory to the doctrine (on which the Rationalist himself rests his argument), that real discrepancies cannot co-exist with inspiration. Where bitter foes thus agree in their testimony, it is scarcely possible that their agreement can have any other basis than truth.

(4.) We might strengthen the arguments we have now offered by adducing many weighty objections which may be alleged against the plenary theory. But the limits of our space forbid. And indeed we have no inclination to do so; for if the arguments we have hitherto advanced be not deemed sufficient, we would not wish to supplement them by objections founded on mere difficulties; which at the best are only logically adequate to the exciting of doubts. But there is, nevertheless, one objection of considerable importance which we wish to notice, in order that we may advert to some other statements of the talented writer in

[k] See a paper in the *Westminster and Foreign Quarterly Review* for Jan. 1850, entitled 'Religious Faith and Modern Scepticism.'

Digitized by Google

the

the Edinburgh, as well as to one or two passages in an article inserted in a former number of the *Journal of Sacred Literature*. The objection is, that *the plenary theory carries revelation out of and beyond its proper sphere.*

In a paper by Mr. M'Combie, 'On the Relation of Scripture to Human Inquiry,' inserted in the *Journal of Sacred Literature*, No. III., are the following statements:—

'Many matters, political, social, and intellectual, . . . take the form of OPINION. Moral truth, on the other hand, takes the form of CONVICTION. . . . Now we conceive that revelation comes in as an authority only in the latter of these,—moral truth, or what involves obligation. It binds duty, but leaves opinion free.' Again: 'It is the fundamental doctrine of Protestantism that the Scriptures are the rule of faith. What is the domain of faith? Only matters not ascertainable through experience, or the exercise of reason. Whatever becomes matter of science is removed from this domain. All matters then on which the sacred writers may have had occasion to speak, coming within the region of science, or which may be ascertainable by observation, induction, or independent investigation of whatever kind, are not matters of faith. The Scriptures give no authoritative deliverance on them.' Again: 'What were faith, where everything was clear, and no difficulty; that were not faith, but science.' (pp. 46, 47. 51.)

From the afore-cited article in the *Edinburgh Review*, entitled 'Reason and Faith, their Claims and Conflicts,' we make the following extracts:—

'Reason and faith are coeval with the nature of man, and were designed to dwell in his heart together' (p. 293). 'We should rather compare reason and faith to the two trusty spies . . . who confirmed each other's report of that good land. . . . We should represent Reason and Faith as twin-born beings. . . Hand in hand the brother and sister, in all mutual love, pursue their way; by day the eyes of Reason are the guide of Faith, and by night the ear of Faith is the guide of Reason' (p. 294). 'If we give an unchecked ascendancy to either reason or faith, we vitiate the whole process' of our education to virtue. 'The chief instrument by which that process is carried on is not reason alone or faith alone, but their well balanced and reciprocal interaction. It is a system of alternate checks and limitations, in which reason does not supersede faith, nor faith encroach on reason. . . . In the domain of reason, men generally include, 1st, intuitions; 2nd, necessary deductions from them; and 3rd, deductions from their own direct experience: while in the domain of faith are ranked all truths, and propositions which are received, not *without* reasons indeed, but for reasons underived from the intrinsic evidence . . . of the propositions themselves; for reasons extrinsic to their meaning' (p. 295). 'Such is that strict union—that mutual dependence of reason and faith, which would seem to be the great law under which the moral school in which we are being educated is conducted. . . . To this law Christianity, in the demands it makes on *both* principles conjointly, is evidently adapted. . . . Man cannot advance a step, indeed, without both' (p. 297).

Digitized by Google

297). 'The most striking example of the helplessness to which man is soon reduced, if he relies on his reason alone, is,' &c. (p. 298). 'The harmonious and concurrent exercise of reason and faith becomes absolutely necessary,—not of reason to the exclusion of faith, for otherwise there would be no adequate test of man's docility and submission; nor of a faith that would assert itself not only independent of reason, but in contradiction of it—which would not be what God requires, a *reasonable* obedience' (p. 301). 'As God with his children, so man with his makes the concurrent development of *their* reason and *their* faith his object' (p. 303). 'It is now easy to detect in many minds a tendency to divorce reason from faith, or faith from reason, and to proclaim that what God hath joined together shall henceforth exist in alienation. The old conflict between the claims of these two guiding principles (in no age wholly suppressed) is visibly renewed in our day' (p. 304). 'The Tractarianism and new infidelity of Oxford are the natural results of attempting to give predominance to one principle of our nature, where two or more are designed reciprocally to guard and check each other' (p. 305). 'If faith spread not the sail to the breeze, or if reason desert the helm, we are in equal peril' (p. 306). 'Man's reason triumphs in the proofs, and his faith triumphs over the difficulties' (p. 305).

We have extracted at so great a length from the last-named article for the following reasons:—1st. Because we cannot but feel great distrust of our own judgment in differing from so able a writer, and have therefore thought it right to afford our readers the means of forming their own opinion as to which party has truth on his side. (We would wish to guard against misrepresenting this writer, if we have not rightly apprehended his meaning, and to have our own error laid bare, if indeed the error be on our side.) 2ndly. Because such ample quotation will materially help eventually to show and to limit the proper province of revelation. 3rdly. In order that we may take occasion to point out one or two errors, which, though it is true that they do not strictly come within the scope of our immediate subject, are yet so intimately connected with it, and are so common, and have such important practical bearings, that we may, we think, be excused in a short digression.

We understand the above-cited writers to hold that there are two great 'principles' or faculties inherent in man, designed to dwell in his heart together, by means of which he apprehends truth, or distinguishes between truth and error. Both writers agree in designating these severally by the terms 'reason' and 'faith;' and the first-named distinguishes their respective subjects, or 'the forms they take,' as those of 'opinion' and 'conviction.' Each of these principles, they consider, has its proper and definable domain, into which the other may, but not without evil consequences arising, intrude: the two may, and

Digitized by Google actually

actually do, have mutual 'claims and conflicts;' and unless these are satisfactorily adjusted, and each has its fair share allotted to it, 'we vitiate the whole process of our education to virtue.' The respective domains of reason and faith they define as above. But while the two have these proper to them, they are represented as mutually dependent and interacting, and as balancing one another. It is the province of reason to triumph in the proofs, and of faith to triumph over the difficulties. Faith appears to be regarded by these writers, as having in it of the nature of virtue.

Now with all due deference to these writers, we altogether demur to their statements respecting the nature, provinces, and relations of reason and faith, and shall now proceed to state our objections.

'Reason' and 'faith' we take to denote things of a totally different generic nature. They are not two separate principles of the same kind. Consequently they cannot be compared or contrasted,—have distinct 'domains' of a similar nature,—be liable to mutual 'encroachments' and 'checks,'—or be each an instrument of acquiring a knowledge of truth. There can be no 'union,' no 'dependence,' no 'concurrent exercise,' no 'reciprocal inter-action,' no 'divorce,' no 'claims,' and 'no conflicts' between them, as on an equal footing. And it cannot be a correct representation to describe them as 'guides' to each other, or the one as answering to the impelling 'breeze,' and the other to the guiding 'helm.'

By 'Reason' we understand 'the faculty or faculties, or the exercise of them, by means of which *alone* we can arrive at truth;' and by 'Faith,' 'a state of mind which we are brought into by the exercise of those faculties.' Faith therefore is the consequent, of which reason is the antecedent: faith is the effect, of which reason is the cause. How then can they be independent principles, and have mutual claims and conflicts?

When a proposition is submitted to us—say, *e. g.* that 'Christianity is a revelation from God'—we examine it by the use of our reason: we weigh the evidences and objections, balance the probabilities and improbabilities, and arrive at some conclusion with regard to it. If the state of mind or opinion produced amount to a certain degree of assurance of its truth, we believe it, or have faith in it. Such is the result with regard to it as a whole. But is there not a distinction to be drawn with regard to its component parts: that is, does not 'reason triumph in the proofs, and faith triumph over the difficulties?' By no means. Reason arrives at conviction by consideration of the proofs, but no faith is exercised with regard to the difficulties. These are simply set aside *at the dictate of reason*, either on the ground of our imperfect information, or of our limited capacity.

Digitized by Google

Turning

Turning to Johnson and Walker, we find the only meanings given to these words which can be admissible in the connection in which they are used by these writers to be these:—Reason, 'the power by which man deduces one proposition from another, or proceeds from premises to consequences;' 'the rational faculty.' Faith, 'belief of the revealed truths of religion;' 'trust in God.' Whether we attach to faith the sense of 'belief,' or of 'trust,' it is evidently the offspring and product of reason; and can have existence only in connection with, and in consequence of its exercise. When we believe anything, or trust any one without or beyond the dictate of reason, it is credulity or superstition, and not faith that we exercise. And this term 'credulity' is indeed that which the writer in the *Edinburgh* ought commonly to have used instead of 'faith.' And it would have appeared strange that he did not do so (seeing he so highly commends Archbishop Whateley's little work, in which the distinction betwen faith and credulity is so clearly laid down) if it were not that to have done so would have subverted his whole argument. Archbishop Whateley says, 'When a man believes without evidence or against evidence' (and there can be no doubt that he intends just in that degree which reason on the examination of evidence dictates), 'he is what we rightly call credulous,' to that extent exactly in which he goes beyond the verdict of reason.

Reason, in short, denotes one thing: opinion, faith, conviction, knowledge, denote degrees or kinds of another thing, more or less produced by and dependent on the first. 'Opinion' appears to be the lowest and generic term: everything that we believe, are convinced of, or know, we entertain an opinion about; but every opinion we entertain does not amount to faith, conviction, or knowledge. 'Faith' appears to be used most commonly in reference to the testimony of others. 'knowledge' to our own observation, and 'conviction' as an intermediate term when the evidence is of a mixed kind; and hence each word indicates the source whence the proof is derived, and assigns to the opinion adopted a peculiar character, but without necessarily affirming any difference of degree in the assurance attained. It would not seem that these terms can be rightly appropriated to any particular subjects. We may entertain opinions on points of duty, and arrive at conviction with regard to 'matters political, social, or intellectual.' We may exercise faith in reference to 'any conclusion in science based on direct experiment or observation' (*Edinb. Rev.*, p. 295), and have a knowledge of any things which come within the range of observation. And hence we conclude that the distinction drawn by the first-cited writer is arbitrary and erroneous.

The use of reason, it should be remembered, is voluntary; but faith

Digitized by Google

faith is involuntary. Locke has well proved faith to be a matter of necessity, not of choice: a man cannot choose to believe, or not to believe. On this account also our assertions must be admitted.

It may be supposed, from what has hitherto been said, that this is a question of words rather than of things. And, if this were the case, it would be by no means of small importance to detect their misapplication. For it is to this cause, we think—namely, the misuse or imperceptibly shifting use of terms—that the fallacies into which a writer is led, or the misapprehensions into which his readers fall, may be chiefly attributed. But there is, moreover, a special reason in the instance of such terms as reason and faith. It is well known to be the common practice of infidels to allege that revelation will not endure to be tried by reason, and that, in fact, its advocates do virtually rest its claims altogether on faith. 'Believe only,' say its preachers, 'and you shall be saved:' 'Let your faith triumph over the difficulties you meet with, and all will be right.' Greatly as they misrepresent the meaning of those who thus speak, there is a speciousness about the perversion which we have reason to know gives it efficacy with numbers. It would on this account be desirable to abstain from even the legitimate *use* of the terms in such a contrast as may form a handle to opponents; how much more from the *misuse!*

But that the present is not a mere 'war of words' will appear from the consideration that the misuse of the terms in question has laid a fallacy (in our humble opinion) at the root of a very ably-conducted argument, and has led both writers into an erroneous representation of the nature of faith, and to a most undue extension of its proper province, if it can, indeed, with propriety be said to have any domain at all.

A *petitio principii* arises out of the very title of the article 'Reason and Faith: their Claims and Conflicts.' It is assumed that they are of a nature to have separate claims; that they engage in conflicts, and may trench upon each other's domain. This ought to have been proved. We deny the position, and (as we think) have disproved it.

Again, when the one writer asks, 'What were faith where everything was clear, and no difficulty; that were not faith, but science:' and when the other speaks of faith as the 'test of man's docility and obedience,' each appears to regard it as something optional, and praiseworthy or virtuous (or, at least, indicative of a virtuous frame of mind); whereas, as we have shown, it is not a voluntary act or frame (in the connection in which it is here used), and therefore cannot have anything virtuous in it or connected with it. If we believe in any religion, in spite of many difficulties, it is because reason declares that the balance of evidence is in its favour.

Digitized by Google

favour. To believe in Christianity at the dictate of right reason can no more have anything virtuous in it, or be a proof of docility, than to disbelieve in Mahommedanism under the same dictate can be blameworthy or a token of indocility. The misapprehension here appears to have arisen from the double sense in which the word 'faith' is used, as meaning 'belief' and 'trust.' This double meaning is so common a cause of serious error and confusion, that we have thought it worth while to go somewhat out of our way to direct attention to it, though so obvious and so often pointed out. When the word 'faith' is used, as by these writers, in reference to propositions and evidences, it must have the former signification; and then, as denoting simply a state of the understanding, it can in itself be neither optional, nor desirable or undesirable: but when it is used in reference to intelligent beings, it bears the second meaning; and, being an affection of the heart, becomes a virtue, which, when the Supreme Being is its object, is the chief of virtues, capable itself of unlimited growth, and moreover the root and life of every Christian grace.

But the point with which we are here chiefly concerned is the proper 'domain of faith' (to use the mode of speaking adopted by these writers); and in exhibiting this we think we shall show that they have been led unduly to extend what they call the province of faith (but which we should term 'the province of revelation'), through treating faith as a principle co-ordinate with reason.

The senses of ourselves or others are the sole instruments by which we gather in the rough materials of knowledge. These it is the office of reason to reduce to order and to store, and from these to winnow the grains of truth. According as we obtain the materials, immediately by our own senses, or mediately by those of others, we may style them the fruits of observation or of testimony. Reason is equally necessary in both cases to the eliciting of truth and the avoidance of error; and faith enters alike into both, with a difference only of degree. In the one case there is a single risk only of error—the involuntary delusion of the senses; but in the other a double risk—the chance of voluntary deception as well as of involuntary mistake. In the one case the object of faith is a man's own faculties; in the other it is not only those of his fellow-men, but also their integrity.

Truth may be derived in an equal degree from observation and from testimony, or exclusively from either, or in any possible combination from the two. In proportion as it is drawn from the former or the latter more or less exclusively, it may be thought that it may properly be said to be apprehended by reason or by faith, because the demand upon faith keeps pace, or more than keeps pace with the increase of the ratio of testimony to observation;

Digitized by Google

tion; and much more than double the amount of faith is requir d to receive anything upon pure testimony than upon pure observation. But this is not the case. No such contrast can lie between reason and faith; for, on the one hand, the more exclusively anything is to be received on testimony, and the more complicated and doubtful the testimony is, and, consequently, the more faith is required, just so much the more need is there for the exercise of reason to scrutinize and judge of the testimony. So that reason enters more than *pari passu* with faith. And, on the other hand, if any such contrast existed, it would be necessary, in order to complete the parallelism, that in proportion as we obtained any knowledge by personal observation, we should be able to say that we received it by the exercise of reason, which would manifestly not be the case. The fact is, the only contrast—the only claims and conflicts, lie between the two means of knowledge; and into every claim and conflict faith must enter in the same capacity, though not in the same degree, and reason likewise, holding the same office of scrutator and judge.

But, without the sphere of testimony and observation, there lies on either side a wide domain, inaccessible to though founded upon these. On the side of pure observation, but beyond its limits, and at the remotest point from pure testimony, lies the province of abstract reasonings, in which the testimony of others can have no place, and even the intervention of our own senses may to some extent be dispensed with. On the opposite side, wholly removed from the observation of sense—and, while resting extrinsically on testimony, wholly excluding it intrinsically—lies the domain of such high spiritual truths as can neither be discovered by reason nor reasoned upon when discovered. These, therefore, can only reach us by revelation of God.

And what these must be is fully evident. They can be NONE OTHER THAN THE COUNSELS OF GOD FOR OUR SALVATION. Into these, and these alone, the eye of reason cannot pierce, much less the slow hand of sense take hold of them. These, therefore, are the only proper topics for revelation. All others may be either discovered or canvassed by sense and reason, or are not essential for man to know; and, consequently, it would not consist with the economy of the Divine procedure that God should make revelations with regard to them.

Here, then, *if anywhere*, may be found the proper domains of reason and faith. On the one side, it may be said, is pure reason; and on the other is pure faith. Viewing the matter in this light, where are their respective domains placed? At the most remote points of two divergent lines; at the very antipodes of one another. How, then, can they be liable to mutual encroachments from each other? Is it likely—we may almost say,

Is

Digitized by Google

Is it possible—that here either should intrude upon the province of the other? Between them lies a wide domain, more or less common to both; and hence *in reference to this*, with more appearance of reason, the occurrence of mutual 'claims and conflicts' may be predicated. But, where God alone can testify or abstract reasonings alone deduce truth, there it would seem no room could be left for reason or for faith respectively to effect an entrance, or so much as plant a foot; at any rate, the same amount of ignorant self-sufficiency as might in the one case lead a clown to question the truth of a demonstrated proposition in mathematics would be equally requisite in the other.

But, indeed, we hold it to be erroneous to represent the matter at all in this point of view. Reason should rather be regarded in the light of judge trying a cause, in which[1] Observation and Testimony are witnesses, and Faith is the plaintiff. Each witness may have more or less evidence to give, and that evidence may be more or less consistent or inconsistent; or only one witness may be brought forward, whose testimony may appear in many points self-contradictory. The office of the judge is to sift the whole evidence before him, and to give to each part its due weight. In doing this he may err, by giving undue preponderance either to the respective, mutual, and general consistencies of the testimonies, or to their discrepancies and the difficulties attending their reception; and in consequence he may pronounce a judgment more or less erroneous for or against Faith. But in no case can the judge and the plaintiff come in contact, or possess provinces upon which they may mutually encroach. In a question such as that under consideration—which is purely one of testimony, arising out of the observation of others—reason would seem to be the arbiter even more exclusively than in one in which we depended solely on the testimony of our own senses. But, in reality, Reason is equally the judge in both; and it is only when (on the one side) human sense cannot pierce through the veil which shrouds 'the things of God,' so as to yield the evidence either of observation or of testimony, or when (on the other) it is eliminated by Reason itself, that Reason vacates the seat of the judge—in the one case to prostrate itself before the throne of God, in the other to become itself the witness. But even here Reason is not excluded, nor can Faith with propriety be said to take its place; for (on the one side) Reason becomes an arbitrary sovereign, excluding all testimony, and following only its own dictates; and (on the other), though it cannot enter as a judge when the Sovereign and Supreme Judge condescends to bear witness, it yet finds admittance as a learner, and to its strivings to apprehend the 'testi-

[1] Under this name may be included all 'intuitions,' if such things there be.

mony

Digitized by Google

mony of God' in all its fulness, is no less, if not more than ever due all genuine and acceptable faith. Faith may, indeed, be said to be doubly indebted to Reason here—first, for the verdict it pronounced in its favour on the extrinsic evidences, and, secondly, for the clear apprehension and full reception of the intrinsic truths.

Thus Faith in every point of view is the offspring of Reason—not a principle co-ordinate with it. And all that the teaching of the writer in the 'Edinburgh' amounts to is this, that Reason, as the director of the blindfolded goddess, ought to take good heed with careful hand and wary eye to guide her balance even, being neither too ready to receive testimony without examination and cross-examination; for this would be credulity (not faith), and would lead to superstition, fanaticism, spiritual despotism, and the like; nor yet too prone to attach weight to difficulties (the necessary consequences of 'seeing as yet but in part'), for this would be incredulousness, and would lead to scepticism, infidelity, and universal Pyrrhonism. Both these alike are *irrational*—offences against, or rather errors of *reason;* and neither are or can be in the nature of things intrusions of or on faith—a principle which, in the sense the word bears here, has no substantive existence. And, therefore, pretty as the antithesis may sound, we cannot 'conclude that God has created two great lights,—the greater light to rule man's busy day, and that is Reason; and the lesser light to rule his contemplative night, and that is Faith. But Faith itself shines only as long as she (*sic*) reflects some illumination from the brighter orb' (*Edinburgh Review*, p. 356).

If, now, in this discussion we seem to have wandered somewhat from the subject proposed, it will be found on consideration to be in appearance only—an appearance derived from the erroneous representations we have deemed it necessary to correct, in order to replace them by that which, we trust, we have satisfactorily shown to be true, viz., that 'THE TRUTH' is the alone subject of Divine testimony, or is *the sole province of* REVELATION; and here Reason is the interpreter; all other subjects are matters for human testimony alone, and, consequently, fall *within the domain of Reason*,—Reason being, as to these, not only the interpreter, but the sole and sovereign (see *Edinburgh Review*, p. 297) judge. If this be so, the universal-plenary view must be erroneous.

2. If the arguments we have now advanced have any validity in them, it will necessarily follow that—

(1.) The only tenable theory of Inspiration is that which we maintain. This theory has the advantage of retaining all that is essential to or valuable in Christianity, while it sets it free from all the host of difficulties and objections which would be sufficient logically to subvert it, if the popular theory could alone be true. It allows the sceptic and infidel full liberty to criticise and object on

Digitized by Google

on all matters purely secular; but it says, Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther. It lays down a broad line of demarcation. It takes its stand on 'THE TRUTH'—on a height far above out of their reach, where and where alone they cannot be 'competent to judge.' And in this lies the great advantage of this theory. All the rest are unable to point out any clear and definite line of distinction that may be drawn. The consequence is, that when their advocates are once driven to make a concession never so trifling, though but the variation of a word, the whole system is rendered insecure: an entrance is obtained for the small end of the wedge, and the main difficulty being overcome, it is become only a question of time, and of a few blows more or less. Under these theories, it is a question of degree—a war of posts rather than a pitched battle; and there appears no good reason why the enemy should not carry the whole in detail—why he should not go on from a word to a verse, and from a verse to a chapter, and from a chapter to a book, and so on to the whole. If a discrepancy may occur at all between passages, some better distinction than that of the number of words or sentences contained in them is obviously necessary; and where it can be found, except in the character of the subjects, we know not.

We might adduce many more arguments in confirmation of our theory; as, for instance, the unity which the Scriptures exhibit in reference to religion, and the auctorial diversity in all other respects;—the appeal which Christ and His apostles made to this unity as the grand proof of their Divine origin;—the indication of the extent to which Inspiration was vouchsafed in the statement (2 Tim. iii. 17) of that for which it was profitable; the absurdity of extending the Inspiration beyond the Revelation, the authentication of the communication beyond the thing to be communicated; which was to make known the way of life, to bring life and immortality to light, to make wise unto salvation;—that the apostles neither claimed (Gal. ii. 2) nor did the Church recognize in them (Acts xi. 2) the influence of the Spirit in all they delivered;—and that the object of Revelation and Inspiration being to fit the soul for communion with God, the contents of every record must be tried by or have an adaptation to this end. But we have already much exceeded our allotted space, and with a few words in reference to objections, will bring this paper to a close.

(2.) Objections and difficulties attending our view may doubtless be alleged in abundance, but these are nothing to the purpose; and we might content ourselves by meeting them with the assertion that greater difficulties have been proved to attach to every other. If, as we have shown, any more comprehensive theory than that we maintain is wanting in positive proof and obnoxious to disproof, then no ill consequences, whether real or fictitious

Digitized by Google

fictitious, attaching to our theory can alter the case with regard to others—can furnish proof to that which has none, or take away a negative which has been clearly established. The only effect that objections could have (if there were any of sufficient weight) would be to subvert our hypothesis and undermine the doctrine of Inspiration *in toto:* they might pull down, but it is contrary to their nature to build up. Were we writing a complete treatise on Inspiration, it would be proper to notice objections; but it were alike incompatible with our object, our space, and our inclination to advert to them here.

Since the preceding Essay was written the article on Reason and Faith has been republished by the author in a separate form.

He appears to be sensible of the weakness of that part of his argument to which we have adverted, for two notes out of three in the Appendix are devoted to the confirmation of it. In the first Note (No. 2), he admits that the doctrine he laid down must be 'received with limitations.' Into the text he has introduced a material qualification, making it read, 'We cannot be competent judges either as to ALL *which*,' instead of 'what, it is worthy of the Supreme Being to reveal.' And in the note he observes:—

'Neither Butler nor any one else can be supposed to have meant that the *whole* of Christianity is to be regarded as a system so far beyond our capacity of judging of it, that we are absolutely incompetent to pronounce on the wisdom or excellence of any part. . . . . All that can be maintained is, ... that though we see many parts of Christianity are worthy of God, we are not hastily to conclude that where we do *not* see this, such *parts* do *not* come from Him.'

Now, in the first place, we would observe that we might reasonably expect that such a writer 'would say what he meant,' especially when it could so easily be expressed with accuracy. And accordingly, we did not hesitate to understand him to 'mean what he said.' Not, however, that we pressed his words to the extreme of supposing him to intend that there is 'absolutely no part of Christianity of the wisdom and excellence of which we are incompetent to judge.' But the original was such as to leave it doubtful to what extent this doctrine of incompetency might be applied. And we could not but suppose that it was intended to give it considerable latitude, because otherwise it would be of little or no avail for the purpose of obviating objections. But as the statement is now put it cannot be questioned; in fact, it seems to be reduced to a mere truism. To name but one of the inscrutable 'mysteries of the kingdom of heaven' would suffice to bear out the assertion that we cannot be competent judges as 'to *all* which it is worthy of God to reveal.' And again, what rational man would be likely hastily to conclude that, because he did

Digitized by Google

did not see *all the parts* of Christianity to be worthy of God, therefore it did not proceed from Him?

The fact is, this way of putting the matter leaves it just as it found it,—no less open to the entrance of objections. For the objector will readily admit the principle, but as certainly narrow its limits so as not to affect himself. What we want is, that some rule be laid down by which it may be determined what we are competent to judge of; some plain line of demarcation drawn which may fence off that which is beyond our capacity. Until this is furnished, no approach can be made to a settlement of the point in debate, nor even an intelligent discussion of it carried on.

To supply this want our author's theory seems quite incompetent, but ours meets it sufficiently for the purposes of the argument.

Every one who believes in Christianity as a revelation from God must allow that all parts of it are equally from God; and that although some parts of it, by reason of their extending beyond the reach of our finite comprehensions (even as the doctrines of natural religion do), exceed our competency to pronounce on their wisdom and excellence, this is no reason for our rejecting *them*, and much less the whole. But what is meant by the term 'Christianity?' and what are parts of it? We apprehend that a great deal of fallacy in argument is connected with the use of this word; and that if it were accurately ascertained what Butler means by 'the scheme of Christianity,' and this writer by 'the system of Christianity,' and what we intend by 'Christianity' or the 'Truth,' it would be found that we are speaking of very different things.

But we need not dwell on this note, since it does not really affect our present argument. For even if the author includes historical and like questions under the name of *Christianity*, we presume he will not contend that they form *a part of it of which we are incompetent to judge*.

In his second note (No. 3) he discusses the question between 'the two theories accounting for the variations and discrepancies in the Scriptures.' He says it is quite possible 'to take exceptions to certain portions as errors of the writers, and yet apply this principle within perfectly innocuous limits.' This would be very true if it were (as he puts it) merely a question of 'the substantial credibility of the records;' but, in laying claim to inspiration, much more than this is predicated,—even the minutest accuracy and agreement wherever or to whatever extent inspiration is assumed to have operated. So that the claim to Divine authentication must be given up before this statement can be admitted, or this theory have a *locus standi*. Nor is the claim to inspiration less incompatible (as shown in the preceding paper) with the other

Digitized by Google

other theory, which attributes discrepancies *either* to the mode of transmission, or to the appearance only, or to some similar cause. The author admits it to be 'hardly supposable that Christianity could be left liable to indeterminate corruption and depravation in the very *act* of propounding it to the world.' But what practical difference is there between the two theories? If it has been corrupted before, it has reached those for whom it was intended; what can it matter *by whom* the corruption was introduced? We contend, therefore, that this admission of the author makes equally as much against the hypothesis which he adopts as the other. And we may say that it can with as little reason be supposed that God would miraculously interpose to authenticate the records of a revelation from himself, and to secure the accurate enunciation of its doctrines therein (and this is the sole occasion for inspiration, for 'substantial accuracy' might be attained without special guidance of the Spirit), as that, having so interposed, he would ever after leave it obnoxious to the corruptions which might enter in the course of unknown ages, not only from the negligence of the custodians, but also from 'pious frauds' within, and from hostile assaults without. On the contrary, we maintain that as there would be greater need, so there is a higher probability, of a preternatural interposition being vouchsafed throughout (it may be) countless ages of change in human affairs and opinions, to preserve in its integrity that which was thought worthy of communication by inspiration at first, than that inspiration should be granted originally, but not preternatural preservation afterwards. The author of the Essay wholly misrepresents the case, when he puts the records of a religion on an equal footing, with respect to preservation, with profane writings; for he entirely overlooks the many motives to and causes of corruption in the former which have no place in the latter. Scarcely any motive can be assigned which would not induce men to endeavour to ascertain and preserve the original statement of a profane historian; but very many arising from sectarianism, bigotry, superstition, fanaticism, or hostility might operate, and have in some instances operated, to introduce corruptions into the canonical records of a religion, the rejection or mutilation of some, and the forging of others. And the very multiplication of copies would tend to multiply various readings, and to perpetuate and sanction accidental or intentional alterations. Our doctrine of preternatural preservation (if proved, as we think it has been, and indeed a necessary corollary from that of inspiration) establishes and guarantees the received canon. But, if it be rejected, we tremble for the consequences; for to advert but to one point: Where can satisfactory evidence be found that the Old Testament Scriptures were, or were likely to have been preserved in their inspired integrity

Digitized by Google
during

during all the vicissitudes through which the Jewish people passed between the times of Moses and Christ?

The author admits it 'to be hardly supposable that Christianity could be left to indeterminate corruption and depravation in the very act of propounding it to the world.' Still less is it, that it could be in the course of transmission; because it would then much more need Divine care, the original teachers of it being much more competent to record with accuracy truths revealed to them, and much more likely from their characters to do so with fidelity, than those into whose hands it would afterwards fall, would be to have either the ability or the inclination to exclude all errors. Again, the author says 'that the Scriptures lay claim to Divine illumination and superintendence to a degree that excludes error from the Sacred books, as they were first given to the world.' And yet, errors do undeniably exist in them as we have them now. What mode of reconciliation is most easy of adoption? Is it not to substitute 'from THE TRUTH' in the last quotation for 'from the Sacred books?' With this alteration his statement will be true and provable from Scripture, which, as it stands, it is not.

And this may afford us a justification (serving also as a rule) for 'rejecting portions of the Scriptures,' without sacrificing an iota of religious truth, which is, that they are *not* 'authenticated by whatever evidences substantiate other statements.' The inspired or supernatural, spiritual element needs to be, and is, authenticated by its appropriate supernatural, external evidences;—the uninspired elements do not need this authentication, but rest upon their appropriate ordinary proofs and indications of veracity. In saying, then, that we reject portions of the Scriptures, we intend only that we do not *claim* for *every* subject (though we do not exclude any book) the authority and authentication of inspiration; their 'substantial credibility' on secular subjects is not denied; it is only put upon the same footing with that of other writers, and this is what the author of the Essay, in one place, is content to claim for it. There is no 'playing fast and loose with the general evidence,' and there is a 'criterion' which his theory needs, but has not.

If, indeed, his hypothesis were 'logically tenable,' and 'the evidence would permit it,' that is, if it could be shown that there are no errors or discrepancies but what may be accounted for on the ground of incompleteness in the narrative or mistakes of transcribers, it might well be 'preferred;' but indeed, in that case, it would cease to be a matter of *preference*, since the basis on which the other hypothesis rests, and which we hold to be irrefragable, viz., that this can *not* be shown, would be taken away.

The objection which he goes on to allege against the last-named hypothesis, that it has no safe-guards, and is infinitely liable to abuse, is indeed good against it, (and *we* should contend equally good

Digitized by Google

good against the hypothesis which he prefers,) *when the doctrine of plenary inspiration is conjoined with either*, but it has no force when that doctrine is *not* maintained; it is therefore only an argument (and we are quite willing to admit its validity) against the doctrine of plenary inspiration.

The writer concludes with asserting that 'neither party is called to give an account of the residuum of insoluble objections.' We cannot assent to this, till we know what is included in this 'residuum;' but we may observe that neither party can be at liberty to leave any residuum of *insoluble* objections. Each is bound to show that there is no objection that *may* not be soluble, though not necessarily bound to produce the true solution.

*** The preceding article is inserted as a contribution towards the discussion of a very important subject, which *must* more and more engage the attention of Biblical students; and although it is not our desire to render this publication unduly polemical, other contributions on the same question will find a place in its pages—,the Editor not holding himself responsible for the different views of the subject which may be expressed in them.

CORRESPONDENCE.

RECONSIDERED TEXTS. No. I.

ROMANS IX. 3:

'For I could wish that myself were *accursed from Christ*, for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.'

SIR,—Various criticisms upon this text having appeared in some recent numbers of your Journal, I hope, especially as the explanation now offered differs very materially from any that have hitherto appeared (being, I believe, altogether new), that you will not refuse to give it an insertion in the pages of your forthcoming number. Its main features consist, first, in regarding the expression '*from Christ*,' as being simply a pious recognition, on the part of the Apostle, of the doctrine of Christ's providential control over all events, so that no suffering could befall him without the express permission and will of Christ; and as being in no way grammatically connected with the word 'accursed;' and secondly, in understanding the word '*accursed*' as simply denoting accursed *in public estimation*.

The difficulties attending a strict interpretation of these two phrases, as they stand in our common version, are both obvious and great. Not a few, therefore,* as is well known, have had recourse to a variety of ingenious, but unsatisfying re-translations; whilst others,* the majority, have endeavoured to reduce the difficulty that seems to embarrass a

* I refer to commentators generally—these remarks having been written prior to the appearance of the papers upon this passage that have been given in several recent numbers of the present Journal.

Digitized by Google

strict

strict interpretation of the verse, by understanding it with limitations. They remark that the Apostle does not say that he did actually and deliberately entertain this wish; that his language must be regarded as hypothetical and conditional, the hypothesis upon which it proceeds being that such a wish were lawful or necessary; that the phrase 'accursed from Christ,' is merely the strong language of excited feeling; that it must be understood with some restriction; and that fairly interpreted, and with due allowance for the intensity and earnestness of deep emotion, it can mean nothing more than that there was a willingness on the part of the writer, if necessary, to suffer almost any thing—excommunication, or even death itself—provided he could thereby promote the salvation of his brethren.

Some understand the word translated '*accursed*' in the sense of 'devoted to suffering or to temporal destruction;' observing 'that the word so translated not unfrequently denotes one who, on occasion of some public calamity, was *devoted to destruction* as an expiatory sacrifice to the infernal gods.' There can be no question, however, that the word, even when so used, implied not merely '*devoted to destruction*,' but devoted as *accursed and execrable*. Any translation, therefore, which suppresses this latter idea, suppresses the most essential feature in the signification of the word, and must of necessity be inaccurate, because deficient and inadequate. I prefer, therefore, to adhere to the common translation of this word, and to understand it also according to its strict and proper sense.

Nevertheless, it is by no means necessary to suppose that the Apostle could desire to be accursed in fact and in reality. It is sufficient if we suppose him (so far as the mere expression '*accursed*' is concerned) simply to express a willingness to be accursed *in public estimation*. To speak of things, not as they really are but as others suppose them to be, is common. In the New Testament this adoption of the language of others is of frequent occurrence—'We are made as the filth of the world, and are the off-scouring of all unto this day' (1 Cor. iv. 13) is one instance out of many; 'We are fools for Christ's sake,' (ver. 10) another; in 2 Cor. xii. 16, we have another; in 1 Cor. i. 18, 21, another; and I am disposed to think that John v. 31, 'If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true,' (though these words are commonly otherwise explained,) may perhaps be regarded as another.

But the difficulty of the verse arises not so much from the word '*accursed*,' considered apart and by itself, as from its supposed grammatical connection with the phrase '*from Christ*.' This it is that is the main cause of the difficulty of the verse.

Some have attempted the removal of the difficulty occasioned by the '*from*,' by suggesting that in this instance the preposition ἀπό should be otherwise translated. There can be no doubt, however, that the common translation '*from*' is literal. '*By*,' the suggestion of many (who understand the ἀπό in the sense of ὑπό,) is objectionable upon grammatical grounds; for, in the original, the word translated '*accursed*,' (literally '*an accursed thing*,') is a substantive, not a participle. All things considered, '*from*,' therefore, is perhaps the best word that can be chosen.

Digitized by Google

Yet

Yet so long as the two phrases '*accursed*' and '*from Christ*' are regarded as grammatically connected, we seem compelled to have recourse either to violent re-translation, or to violent explanation. It is certain, however, that there is no actual necessity that these two expressions should be thus taken in connection. Doubtless they may be so taken (so far as mere syntax is concerned), seeing that '*accursed*' implies, as it were, a sort of separation *from*; but whether they actually should be so taken or not, must, of course, very much depend upon the exigencies of the context, and upon the nature of the sentiment which their connection or separation would respectively convey.

If we turn to the original Greek we shall there find that the '*from Christ*,' has as much the appearance of belonging to the verb εἶναι, or rather to the entire sentence, as of belonging to the word '*accursed*'—the order of the words in the original, being, not εἶναι ἀνάθεμα ἀπό, but ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπό. In connection, therefore, with the proposal already made, with reference to the word '*accursed*,' (viz., that it be understood as meaning accursed *only in public estimation*), and understanding the ἀπό in its usual sense of '*from*,' I would further suggest that we separate these words (grammatically and in idea, if not in order of arrangement), so that they shall no longer appear as a compound phrase expressing unitedly but one idea, but as separate and independent phrases, expressing each of them a separate and distinct idea—the '*accursed*' declaring how much the Apostle was willing to endure, and the '*from Christ*' recognizing Christ as wholly determining whether and what he should endure.

The verse will thus, I imagine, be found to present but little or no difficulty. The phrase '*from Christ*,' thereby becomes simply a pious recognition on the part of the Apostle of Christ's providential power and control; of the fact, that without His express permission and full will, no suffering, no sorrow, could befall him; and the meaning of the Apostle's words will simply be, that so did he love his kinsmen after the flesh, the Jews, that painful as it was to be held in public execration, he could even wish to be, for them, that which for the Gentiles he already was—hated of all men and *accounted execrable, if such were the will of Christ*.

Intimations are continually occurring in his writings, which strongly show that his own preferences would have disposed him to have selected Judæa as the more especial field of his missionary labours rather than Gentile lands. Christ, however, from whom his commission had been received (and upon which account, perhaps, it is that he makes use of the expression 'from Christ,' in preference to the now more usual phrase '*from God*'), having appointed otherwise, he meekly acquiesced in the appointment; but being now, in this 9th chapter of the Romans, about to discuss the doctrine of the abolition of the distinction between Jew and Gentile, he seeks to conciliate and to disarm the prejudice that might be entertained against him by the Jews, for his maintenance of a doctrine so offensive and unpopular, by solemnly, and in language of strong asseveration, stating this preference.

Such, without any change in the translation of the verse beyond the grammatical separation of the words '*accursed*' and '*from Christ*' (by

Digitized by Google

(by means either of a comma, or of inversion and parenthesis), seems to be the simple meaning of the passage. Provided they be separated in idea, a simple comma would sufficiently disjoin them. It is manifest, however, that they would be more thoroughly and effectually separated by inversion and parenthesis; and also that thus disjoined, there would be less risk of regarding them as a compound phrase than there would be if the separation were simply by a comma. No other change is necessary.

Thus, slightly altered, the passage would be literally as follows:—

'For I, even I, could even wish that I were (from Christ) accursed for my brethren, my kinsmen after the flesh.' [b]

Or, it might be paraphrased as follows:—

'I am willing to be accursed, i. e. hated and held in execration, for the Gentiles; but *for the Jews, my brethren, my kinsmen after the flesh, I, even I whom they so misrepresent and vilify, am more than willing; for them (if such were the will of Christ) I could even wish to be thus evil-spoken of, and hated, and abhorred.*'

I have but little to adduce in support of the explanation proposed, beyond this, viz., that not only is the verse susceptible of such interpretation, but that thus explained, the full and proper force of every word is admitted and retained—that the language of the verse is in no respect explained away—that no unexpressed reservations and limitations (such as, that he could *if it were lawful*) are required—and that by the separation of the phrases 'accursed' and 'from Christ,' the verse is freed, without violence, from the appearance of uttering a wish which would otherwise be so tremendous and so awful, as even to necessitate evasive explanation.

As now interpreted we can also readily believe that the words mean all they say; and can admire, without reserve and without revulsion, the intensity of the love which they express. No extravagant excess mars the grandeur of their generous devotedness, and the wish is felt to be no less rational than noble.

One of the tendencies of Christianity is to render a man more or less superior to unmerited contempt, injury, and insult. The wish of the Apostle (which, in fact, is a wish not so much to be 'accursed' as to be 'accursed *for his brethren*') simply and nobly declares this superiority—suffering and obloquy being desired only as being by Divine appointment, unavoidably intermediate to the attainment of the end desired. The only reservation that we need attach to the words is that which the Apostle himself expresses, viz., that to be thus 'accursed' in the service of his brethren should be *from Christ*—a reservation which in no respect detracts from the reality of the intense affection

[b] I insert the first '*even*' to mark the emphasis expressed in the original by the double nominative; and the second, because, from the position, in the Greek, of the verb '*could wish*,' the verb, no less than its nominative, appears to be emphatic.—If any prefer to translate ηὐχόμην 'I wished,' or 'prayed,' rather than as commonly translated, the general sense of the passage, as now explained, will remain the same. In vindication of the common translation of this verb, see Bloomf. in *loc.* and Winer's Idioms, p. 221.—The Homeric sense 'I *gloried*,' in which the word is understood by some (by Wakefield and Dr. Conquest, for example) is altogether at variance with the ordinary prose usage of the word at the period when the books of the New Testament were written.

Digitized by Google

and

and good will which he was evidently anxious that the Jews should believe him to have entertained; and which the words of his wish so unequivocally and decidedly express.

It is surely better, then, to disunite these words than to seek to evade the difficulty that seems inseparable from their connection, by gratuitous, unwarranted, and invented limitations, which, if admitted, would reduce the strong language of real and intense devotedness and love, to the appearance of vain hyperbole and boast—that might be sincere indeed or that might not, but the sincerity of which, from the very nature of the wish, would of necessity for ever remain untested and unproved.

It cannot be a matter of indifference whether we attach a true meaning or a false to the words of an Apostle. If the words, rightly understood, do really express the sentiments supposed, it is of course important that these sentiments should be clearly expressed in the translation. Whether the common explanations, or whether the explanation consequent upon the suggestion that the phrases '*accursed*' and '*from Christ*' be taken separately, and understood as proposed above, be preferable, let others judge. Others may possibly perceive objections to the separation that I fail to perceive myself. I shall be glad to have its propriety either refuted or confirmed.

British Museum. K.

*** That the old Greek commentators regarded these expressions as connected, and as together expressing the idea of *separated from*, proves only that the words are grammatically susceptible of such connection—that they *may be* so connected, not that they *must be*. Whether they should be so or not, is a point that must be determined upon theological grounds rather than a point for the grammatical determination of critic or native commentator:—and, so far as the requirements of mere grammar are concerned, is one, moreover, upon which any classical scholar, even of moderate attainments, is as capable of forming a right judgment as Chrysostom himself. The spirit of asceticism, which in the fourth and succeeding centuries (a degenerate period) was so prevalent and popular, and which so loves that which is excessive and extravagant, would of itself dispose the Fathers to give an ascetic and austere interpretation to a passage grammatically susceptible of such interpretation—for where a favourite opinion or predilection was concerned, these Fathers, however estimable, however superior, in some respects, to the age in which they lived, and however worthy, up to a certain point, of our respect, were as much under the influence of prejudice and prepossession in their interpretations, as ourselves. Their opinions deserve indeed a respectful hearing; but we cannot accept them as oracular, nor consent to regard them as all-sufficient and decisive.

DR. W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER AND DR. S. P. TREGELLES.[a]

To the Editor of the Journal of Sacred Literature.

Sir,—In the last Number of your valuable periodical there appears an article from the pen of Mr. Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, in which he has inserted a series of strictures on part of a paper which appeared some

[a] In giving insertion to this communication from Dr. Alexander, it may be right to remind the reader that the strictures to which it forms a reply occur towards the close

Digitized by Google

some months since in a Journal of which I am editor, containing a short review of the first volume of Dr. Davidson's Introduction to the New Testament. As interested in the reputation of the periodical I edit, and as myself the author of the paper which has provoked Mr. Tregelles' animadversions, I trust you will suffer me to occupy a small space in your next Number with some observations by way of reply to the very angry and, as I think, most unfair, strictures of that writer.

Mr. Tregelles labours throughout the part of his paper in question to hold up the writer in the *Scottish Congregational Magazine* as a very paragon of ignorance in matters of sacred learning. I cannot say that such a charge very greatly moves me. I may be permitted, however, to suggest that such a charge has very little relevancy in the present instance. The question, as it happens, is not one of learning at all; it is simply one of logic and common sense. Assuming that the pages of Jerome and Origen are to me a *terra incognita;* assuming that even were they placed before me I could not translate a word of them, still I may be allowed to ask, What has this to do with the case in hand? Dr. Davidson, whose book I was engaged in reviewing, had professedly culled *all* the passages from ancient authors bearing upon the question of the original language of St. Matthew's Gospel, and had kindly translated them all for the benefit of the unlearned. To understand the evidence, therefore, he had adduced, what *learning*, I pray, was needed? None that I can conceive of. The whole evidence was professedly there, patent to the perusal of any inhabitant of these realms who could read in his mother tongue; and all that was needed was a little judgment to determine whether the evidence adduced was sufficient to sustain the conclusion built upon it. All this vehement outcry, therefore, on the part of Mr. Tregelles against the alleged illiteracy of the reviewer of Dr. Davidson's book, I must regard as purely irrelevant to the matter in hand.

Before proceeding to notice more particularly the remarks of Mr. Tregelles, I must remind the reader that the article on which he has animadverted was a review of Dr. Davidson's Introduction, and that the portion of it which has so provoked his ire had reference exclusively to the evidence for the Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel *as stated by Dr. Davidson.* Mr. Tregelles has found it convenient to keep this very much out of sight, and has treated me as if, in the few sentences he has quoted, I had attempted to dispose of the question on its own merits. But I had no such design; my purpose was solely and simply to show that the evidence, as stated by Dr. Davidson, did not support the conclusion he had laboured to build upon it.

This consideration will at once dispose of all Mr. Tregelles has

---

close of an article by Dr. Tregelles 'On the Original Language of St. Matthew's Gospel,' which appeared in the last Number of this Journal. The remarks had reference to an anonymous article in the *Scottish Congregational Magazine*, which now appears to have been from the pen of Dr. Alexander, who is the editor of that publication.—EDITOR.

said

Digitized by Google

said about my 'attacking the witnesses' and so forth. I have done nothing of the sort: I have simply asserted that their testimony, according to Dr. Davidson's showing of it, is incredible because self-contradictory or insufficient. If Dr. Davidson has correctly adduced that testimony, it is for him, or those who agree with him, to free it from the defects which I have alleged against it, if they think this worth their while: if he has not correctly adduced it, let him do so as soon as he can, and in any way he pleases; but in either case it is monstrous to turn round upon me and abuse me because I have said that Dr. Davidson's statement, as it stands, is incredible, unless, indeed, it can be shown that I have *not* taken that statement as it stands, but have misrepresented it. That I have not done so I will presently proceed to show.

In the mean time I may here dispose of another of Mr. Tregelles' charges, to which it will not be needful to return. 'If an inquirer,' says he, 'wholly uninformed on the subject were to read the paper of this assailant, he would of course think that the Hebrew original of St. Matthew was some new and dangerous idea which was quite peculiar to Dr. Davidson.' Indeed! then he must be a very stupid inquirer indeed, for the words with which I introduce the subject are these: 'We much regret that Dr. Davidson *should have gone into the notion*,' &c. Is it usual to speak of a person's *going into* a notion, when we mean to represent him as having *devised* that notion? Or in using such language *could* I have intended to convey the idea that this was a new idea peculiar to Dr. Davidson? True, I might have more formally indicated that Dr. Davidson had no peculiar claims to this idea, and might have easily, from his own pages, collected a long catalogue of names of parties who before him had advocated it. But I deemed this unnecessary; *first*, because, as the reviewer of Dr. Davidson's book, I had to do only with him, and *secondly*, because I was not writing for persons 'wholly uninformed on the subject,' as most religious people in Scotland know something at least of such matters. Of the offence of broaching 'new' and 'peculiar' ideas I will freely acquit Dr. Davidson if Mr. Tregelles thinks it a compliment to that gentleman that I should.

I now pass on to the weightier matters contained in the strictures of my assailant. And first, of my remarks on the evidence adduced by Dr. Davidson from Jerome. This I charged with being self-contradictory, inasmuch as that venerable Father is made to say of one and the same book that it was translated into Greek by an unknown party, and that it was translated into Greek by himself. For this Mr. Tregelles charges me with I know not what obliquity and ignorance, because, as he says, I have confounded what Jerome says of the Greek translation of the Hebrew original of Matthew's Gospel with what he says of the translation of a document which he had himself obtained at Berœa. Now it matters little what I knew or did not know of Jerome's actual statements on these points. The question is, What view has Dr. Davidson given of the matter? Does he represent these two documents, the original Hebrew of Matthew's Gospel and the book

Digitized by Google

book found by Jerome, as *different* or as *one*? Let his own words supply the answer. 'This Gospel [*i. e.* the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the one found by Jerome] was identical with the Aramæan original of Matthew.' In proof of this Dr. Davidson cites a passage from Jerome and then adds, 'Surely the testimony of one who translated the Aramæan copy in the hands of the Nazarenes into Greek and Latin as to the identity of it with the original Gospel of Matthew,' &c., p. 13. Here, then, are Dr. Davidson's own words; so that let Mr. Tregelles declaim as he pleases, it remains indubitable, *first*, that Dr. Davidson holds the two documents to have been *identical*, that is, copies of the same book; *secondly*, that for this he cites the authority of Jerome, to whom he imputes the same opinion; and *thirdly*, that he thus makes Jerome say of one and the same book that he himself translated it into Greek, and that it had been translated by some one whom he did not know. If this last assertion be to impeach the credibility, nay, the sanity, of Jerome, on whom, pray, rests the onus of such irreverence? Not, certainly, on me, for *I* never asserted of Jerome that he believed the two documents to be identical, but on Dr. Davidson, who has so stated Jerome's evidence as to make him thus egregiously contradict himself.

In what way very learned men like Mr. Tregelles may look at this matter I do not know, but sure I am there is no man whose natural intellect has not been enfeebled under a load of other men's thoughts who will not at once see that the question is reducible to a very simple alternative. Either the two documents were copies of the same book, or they were not. If they were not, then has Dr. Davidson misunderstood or misstated Jerome's evidence; if they were, then must Jerome's evidence be treated as that of a man who by flatly contradicting himself makes it *impossible* for any sane mind to believe him. The object of my strictures on Dr. Davidson was to point out that *on his showing* (whatever might be the intrinsic merits of the case) the latter was the verdict which must be pronounced on Jerome: and so far was I from intending this as a slight upon that venerable Father, that it was upon the assumption of his worth and intelligence that I rested the conclusion, which every man who knows anything of reasoning will see I intended to bring out, viz., that it was impossible such a man could have said what Dr. Davidson makes him say.

There is only one way in which Mr. Tregelles and his friend can escape from the dilemma in which they have placed themselves. Assuming, they may say, that the two documents were copies of the same book, is it not possible that Jerome may have made a second translation, though he was in possession of that made by the unknown translator? To this I reply, that such a thing is quite possible. But if this be the hypothesis resorted to, we shall find ourselves in a worse plight than before as to the testimony of Jerome. For, when a man like him, a mature scholar, and one busily engaged in the duties of life, sits down to make a new translation of a book into a language in which a translation of that book already exists, it can only be because he considers the former translation to be sadly *incorrect*. Is this, then, what

Digitized by Google

what we are asked to suppose? Is the testimony of Jerome in reference to the canonical Greek Gospel of Matthew to be held as amounting to a declaration that on comparing it with the original he found it so full of errors that he had to translate the latter over again? This conclusion I have no doubt both Mr. Tregelles and Dr. Davidson will at once repudiate; but in repudiating it they must also relinquish the hypothesis which leads necessarily to it.

If, then, Dr. Davidson's words are to be taken for what they strictly mean, I maintain that my strictures on his statement of the testimony of St. Jerome were perfectly justifiable, and I believe it to be quite impossible for Mr. Tregelles or any one else to extricate that statement, as it stands, from the illogical confusion which characterises it. But, perhaps, it may be said, When Dr. Davidson asserts the *identity* of the two documents he does not mean that the one was so *exactly* a copy of the other but that differences existed between them; nay, he has expressly said that this is his view of the case. 'The diversities,' says he, 'were such as led him (Jerome) to think that it would not be a work of supererogation to translate it into Greek,' p. 15. Now I was quite aware that Dr. Davidson had written thus; but I regarded it as only one of those *lapsus* into which the most careful writers sometimes are betrayed, and consequently did not wish to attach much importance to it. If, however, this hypothesis be now gravely brought forward in vindication of Dr. Davidson's statement of Jerome's evidence, let us see how his reasoning will stand. It is alleged that Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in Aramæan; this several ancient authors attest, repeating what seems to have been a current tradition in some parts at least of the Church; but there is no *certain* proof that any man had ever *seen* any book professing to be this Aramæan original before the time of Jerome. Now Jerome not only saw but took a copy of a document which at the time at least he believed to be the book in question, and the thing to be proved is that it really *was* so. What is Dr. Davidson's proof of this? Why, that such was the amount of *difference* between it and the Greek translation already possessed by St. Jerome that the latter thought 'it would not be a work of supererogation to translate it into Greek!' This reasoning seemed to me so incredibly absurd that I could not believe Dr. Davidson had consciously uttered it, and therefore took no notice of it. Surely Dr. Davidson will not seriously stand to such a paralogism. Can it require beyond a moment's reflection to show that in the absence of the alleged original we can conclude from Jerome's testimony (assuming that such an original ever existed) only one of two things—either that our extant Gospel is no fair translation of that original, or that the book Jerome translated was *not* that original, but only an imitation of it?

Suppose a person living in France to write his will in French, and that a translation into English is brought over to this country, authenticated as correct, and as such is received by all parties concerned. In course of time a person, returning from France, brings with him a copy, as he alleges, of the will in the original; but, on comparing

Digitized by Google

comparing this with the English translation of that original, it is found that the two are so different that the one by no means represents the other. In such a case, what would common sense lead any candid person to decide? Would not such an one say, If this authenticated translation which we have long possessed be genuine, that which professes to be the French original must be a mere forgery; made, in all probability, by some person who had before him the translation, which he followed so far as suited his purposes, but most certainly not the very document of which the translation has hitherto been in our keeping. And yet on Dr. Davidson's principle of reasoning, this conclusion would be quite wrong; the newly-found document ought to be received as identical with the missing original, and that for this astounding reason: that it differed from an authentic translation of that original *only* so much as to render a new translation not superfluous!

I pass on to another point on which Mr. Tregelles has written with great acerbity. 'I suppose,' says he, 'that I shall hardly be expected formally to deny that Dr. Davidson ever asserted such irreverent nonsense as that which the assailant charges him with. Who will believe that he, or any other Christian man or Christian minister, professed to believe in "the inspiration of a writer who makes blunders?"' Now I beg to say I never charged Dr. Davidson with believing anything of the sort. I simply expressed my inability to conceive by what process he reconciled his belief in the inspiration of the canonical Gospel of Matthew with the fact that the author of that translation has not truly represented his original. I spoke of this as a making of blunders on the part of the translator, because I was proceeding on the assumption authorized by Dr. Davidson, that Matthew did write in Hebrew; that we have in the canon only a translation of his Gospel, and not his own production; and that the original of Matthew was identical with the Hebrew Gospel in the hands of the Fathers. Mr. Tregelles very properly says that the fact of the translation being incorrect is a thing to be proved, and he demands where such proof is to be found. I refer him, in reply, to the pages of Dr. Davidson's book. Beginning at page 17, and going on to page 29, he will find a series of extracts, full of discrepancies, between the canonical Gospel and the only Hebrew or Aramæan Gospel of Matthew which any of the Fathers are known to have had in their hands. He will find also that Dr. Davidson sums up the evidence of Epiphanius thus: 'Epiphanius speaks of the Ebionite Gospel as not πληρέστατον, but νενοθευμένον και ἠκρωτηριασμένον, "not complete, but adulterated and curtailed." In one passage which he quotes, he says, that the Ebionites change the true account into a falsehood, because they read ἐγκρίδας, *cakes made with oil and honey*, instead of ἀκρίδας, *locusts* (Matth. iii. 4). We have seen also that he accuses them of having altered the sense of another by inserting μή' (p. 32). It cannot be denied, then, that between the extant Greek Gospel and the Hebrew Gospel in the hands of the fathers whom Dr. D. cites, there were many and glaring inconsisteneies, some of which were of

Digitized by Google

of the nature of mistakes. Now there are here two suppositions, one of which we must adopt: either these discrepancies are to be attributed to interpolations on the part of those who transcribed the copies of the Aramæan text, or to omissions, alterations, and mistakes on the part of the individual who translated that text into Greek. Which of these hypotheses, then, will Dr. Davidson take? I presume he will take the former; but, to be consistent with himself, he ought to take the latter, and on the assumption of such consistency my remark was made—not that I believed Dr. Davidson capable of really entertaining such an opinion, but that I wished to call his attention to the logical impossibility of his rejecting it, whilst he held by the opinion that our canonical Gospel is only a translation. For, if this be the case, how can he *prove* that the discrepancies in question are not the fault of the translators? Let it be remembered that of the alleged Hebrew original of Matthew we know *nothing*. All that we know is, that between a book affirmed by Dr. Davidson to be identical with that original, and a work alleged to be a translation of that original, there are numerous gross discrepancies. How can Dr. Davidson prove that these are not the faults of the translator? Will he say with Mr. Tregelles, 'If inspired, he made none'? What does this mean? Does Mr. Tregelles believe in the inspiration of *translators* of sacred Scripture? If so, he may lay claims himself to the dignity; for he too has translated an inspired book? Or does he mean to assert that he has discovered (what baffled the diligence of Jerome) the person who made this so-called translation from Matthew's original, and that he has recognized in him one of the inspired founders of our faith? I know not what meaning to affix to this oracular dictum, and must therefore leave it to stand for what the reader may think it worth.

Perhaps it may be said, We believe these documents seen by Jerome and others to have been interpolated, because these fathers themselves tell us so. But this only moves the question a step back: it is still competent to inquire how did these witnesses know this? None of them ever saw the original Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew; none of them had any means of determining what was genuine and what interpolated in the documents they found, except by comparing them with the Greek canonical Gospel; none of them, therefore, had any better means of judging on this head than we have. But on Dr. Davidson's hypothesis *we* have none whatever, as I have showed above; whence it follows, by parity of reason, that *they* had none. I say 'on Dr. Davidson's hypothesis,' because in reality I believe they proceeded on the surest grounds, viz., the authenticity of the Greek text; but this ground Dr. D. would reject both for himself and them, and must consequently be dealt with on the supposition that it is rejected.

I marvel exceedingly that both Dr. Davidson and Mr. Tregelles should refer us to the Codex Bezæ, as presenting a parallel case to that of the document found by Jerome at Berœa, and similar documents cited by some of the Christian fathers. No doubt that Codex may be identified with other MSS. of the New Testament and its interpolations

Digitized by Google

interpolations accurately discriminated. But how? Manifestly just because there *are* other MSS. with which to compare it. But suppose we had no other Greek MS. of the New Testament but this Codex, and had but one ancient translation—say the Syriac—made by some unknown person with which to compare it, the case would then be somewhat analogous to that before us; and in such a case I should like to know by what means we could be *sure* which was an interpolation in the Codex, and which was a wilful alteration or unintentional mistake on the part of the translator; or how any man, who asserted that the Codex was identical with the lost original, could, with logical consistency, believe in the infallible accuracy of the translation.[a]

Without, then, wishing to insist upon Dr. Davidson's holding any opinions which may be discreditable to him, either as a man or as a minister, I must be allowed to repeat that he is bound to explain how it is possible for him to believe in the perfect correctness of the canonical Gospel as a translation from the original Aramæan of Matthew, whilst it differs materially from what he believes to have been *copies* of that original, and which, if so, *are the only copies of it known to have existed; the only copies of it ever known to have been seen by any man.*

Mr. Tregelles seeks to be very sarcastic with me for saying that of Dr. Davidson's witnesses 'only one says that he had ever seen the Hebrew Gospel, and one or two professedly quote it.' This he tries to twist so as to pour ridicule on me for insinuating that the 'one or two' referred to quote the book without having seen it. But surely a man with an eye in his head ought to be able to see that the distinction drawn in the words quoted is not between those who cited the book having seen it, and those who cited the book without having seen it; but between those witnesses who actually *depone* to having seen the book without citing it, and those whom we may *infer* to have seen it from their professedly quoting it.

After quoting a passage from Origen, which appears as one of that Father's citations from the Hebrew Gospel, I had exclaimed, 'Think of such an abomination as this being passed on us as part of Matthew's genuine original Gospel!' To this Mr. Tregelles vehemently rejoins, 'Think of it indeed! But *who* tries to pass it as genuine? Does he mean to assert that Dr. Davidson does so? Possibly not.' Oh! but I do; Dr. Davidson says so as plain as words can say it. 'We shall quote,' writes he, p. 18, 'all the notices of this Hebrew Gospel found

[a] Mr. Tregelles is indignant that the assertion that blunders exist in the Greek translation of Matthew's Gospel should be made on my *ipse dixit*. This, of course, it *could* not be, seeing I disbelieve the existence of any translation in the case, and have nothing to do, therefore, with either affirming or denying the existence of errors in such translation. But it is evident that the suggestion is *new* to Mr. Tregelles; he has met it for the first time in my paper. It is strange that so very learned a man should be ignorant that Eichhorn and Michaelis, to name no more, have both formally maintained the existence of errors in the canonical Gospel as a translation from the Hebrew. The former devotes to the proof not fewer than *twelve* closely printed octavo pages.—*Einleit. in das N. T.*, bd. i. s. 517-530. Zweyte Aufl.

in

Digitized by Google

in the works of the Fathers:' *i. e.* the Gospel of the Hebrews—the Gospel identical with Matthew's original; and then, after quoting from Eusebius and others, he comes to Origen, of whom he says, 'Origen gives two passages from it in his extant works,' p. 19. Of these the former is the one I have cited. Now Dr. Davidson may not have *meant* to say what he has said; but with that I have nothing to do. I could take his words only for what they express; and as he has told us plainly that he believes the book from which Origen quotes the obnoxious words to have been identical with Matthew's original, and adduces those very words, thus cited by Origen, as part of a proof that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, I submit it to the judgment of the world whether his own words do not fully bear out what I have said.

Mr. Tregelles, in reply to my remarks on the insufficiency of the evidence on which the advocates of the opinion that the Gospel of Matthew was written by him in Hebrew require us to give up what we have been accustomed to regard as a sacred book, writes thus: 'I answer *first*, no one suggests (except this writer) that we should give up a sacred book; *secondly*, on the *same ground* on which we receive the New Testament Scriptures as genuine (namely, early testimony) ought we to believe in the Hebrew original of St. Matthew; *thirdly*, that the fact is that the early Christians *did* believe in the Hebrew original, and yet they did not preserve it.' To the first of these I shall recur presently; in the mean time a word or two on the second and third. Mr. Tregelles speaks of 'early testimony,' and the 'early Christians.' Does he mean by the former the testimony of *some* or of *all*? and by the latter the early Church *as such*, or only some individuals *in* the early Church? To serve his object in the least degree he must intend his words to mean that the *unanimous* testimony of Christian antiquity is in favour of the Hebrew original of Matthew, and that *all* the early Christians believed in this. But who does not see that this is the very thing he has to *prove*, and which he yet assumes without any proof? My argument was, that as the early Christians were notoriously careful in ascertaining what was authentic, and scrupulous in preserving all that was apostolic, it is incredible that they should have allowed a genuine production of St. Matthew to be lost, whilst they have retained a mere translation of it by no man knows who. How does Mr. Tregelles meet this? Why, by *assuming* the very thing I challenge his side to prove, viz., that the Church, as a Church, ever had and ever believed in a Hebrew original of Matthew! At this rate one may prove anything; for the argument just comes to this—they had it, because they had it. In a note, Mr. T. reproaches me for calling the evidence on his side 'patristic tradition;' I must, however, adhere to the expression. It is patristic tradition, and nothing more—the statement of individual fathers, not the testimony of the early Church. The testimony of the Church is in favour of the book they have preserved and handed down to us: not in favour of the one which, if they ever had it, they have allowed to perish. And what Dr. Davidson, Mr. Tregelles, and all who side with them are attempting is to shake

Digitized by Google

shake by the tradition of individual fathers the testimony of the Catholic Church, conveyed to us in the actual fact that the Greek is that which they have transmitted to us as the canonical Gospel.

I revert now to the first of the three points as Mr. Tregelles's so-called answer to my remarks. 'No one,' says he, 'suggests' (except this writer) 'that we should give up a sacred book.' Assuredly, I do not suggest this, as Mr. Tregelles very well knows; nor do I say that he suggests it; but this I do say, that the position he and Dr. Davidson have advocated leads by a logical necessity to the giving up of the sacredness of the canonical Gospel of Matthew. For if that be only a translation of the Apostle's original, then it is *not* a sacred book in the sense in which the other books of the New Testament are. No translation of a sacred book can claim equal authority with the original, unless made by a man equally qualified by Divine inspiration with the author of that original. From every translation of any part of Holy Scripture, there lies an appeal to the original as alone infallible; and if in this case the original be lost, its infallible authority—that is, its sacredness—has perished with it. This, I say, is a serious matter; and it is one which is not to be settled either by imperious dogmatism or by ridiculing the fears of those who tremble lest they should be deprived of the smallest portion of that treasure which is to them of more value than thousands of gold and of silver.

Michaelis has said, 'If we have lost the original text of Matthew, and have nothing remaining but a Greek translation, we cannot certainly ascribe to the words any divine inspiration; nay, it is possible that here and there the true sense of the Apostle may have been missed by the translators' (*Einleit.* Bd. ii. s. 99, Vierte Aufl.). That Dr. Davidson admits the force of this reasoning I cannot help inferring from his allowing to Matthew's Greek Gospel only what he calls 'virtual inspiration.' What he may intend to include under this novel and mysterious phrase I have already professed my inability to conjecture, and though Mr. Tregelles has promised an explanation of it, I am as much in the dark as ever; but what he means to exclude by it is manifest enough. By claiming for Matthew's canonical Gospel only *virtual* inspiration he must intend to exclude it from any claim to *actual* or *real* inspiration; else does he use words without any meaning. Now, will Mr. Tregelles tell me what is the difference between asking us to give up the *actual inspiration* of a book and asking us to give up *the sacredness of that book*?

Mr. Tregelles refers his readers to a subsequent part of his paper for an explanation of the phrase 'virtual inspiration.' I presume he alludes to what appears in pages 184, 185, where he argues for the inspiration of Matthew's Gospel from its universal reception as a sacred book by the first Christians.

On this I content myself with observing:—

First; In order to prove the 'virtual inspiration' of Matthew's Gospel, he shows that it stands upon exactly the same basis of evidence with the other books of the New Testament. From this it, of course, follows that for the New Testament as a whole we can claim only

Digitized by Google

only virtual inspiration! If Matthew's Gospel stand upon exactly the same evidence as the other books, and if that evidence is sufficient to attest for it no more than virtual inspiration, it follows by logical necessity that it can attest as much and no more for the other books of the New Testament.

Secondly; As the early Christians received Matthew's Gospel in Greek as inspired on the ground of its being the authentic production of the Apostle, Mr. Tregelles holds this sufficient ground for our receiving it as inspired, even though we may be assured that it is not the authentic production of the Apostle. This seems to me pretty much as if a witness in a court of law were to swear that a certain document was worthy of being received on the ground that it bore the signature of a particular party; and Mr. Tregelles were to rise, and having first proved that the signature was not that of the party sworn to, should nevertheless insist that, though the ground on which the witness rested was quite untenable, his testimony should be held convincing, and that especially because he had rested it on that ground!

Thirdly; The worth of the testimony of the early Christians in such matters depends upon the extreme improbability of their falling into any error as to the source whence any book pretending to be inspired proceeded. On this Mr. Tregelles rests, as every other writer on the subject must more or less rest, in pleading for the inspiration of the New Testament books. But Mr. Tregelles, unlike every other writer on the subject, removes with one hand the foundation he lays with the other. His argument, in fact, is this: as the early Christians could not be mistaken in such matters, we are bound to receive as inspired what they received as inspired. But in this case they *were* mistaken, for they took for Matthew's Gospel what turns out to have been only a translation of it; *therefore* we are to receive it as inspired!

Another specimen of Mr. Tregelles's dialectical skill occurs in the analogy he institutes (p. 184) between Tertius, Paul's amanuensis, and the unknown translator of Matthew's Hebrew into Greek. Because, forsooth, the words of St. Paul, though written by another man's pen, are still the words of St. Paul, therefore the words of a translator are the words of the author whose book he translates; in other words, a translation of an ancient book made by an unknown party is to be received as equivalent to the words of the original writer, *because* a book which exists not in a translation but in the original is to be received as containing the words of its author, though he employed an amanuensis to write them down; from all which it follows that the *mind* of a translator stands in the same relation to the mind of the author he translates, as the *pen* of an amanuensis to the mind of the author at whose dictation he writes; in short, that writing from dictation and translating a book are exactly the same thing, as regards the conveyance to a third party of the mind of the original speaker or writer!

Mr. Tregelles says that I 'owe an apology to both Dr. Davidson and Jerome.' If he will be kind enough to tell me how a man living in the middle of the nineteenth century can make an apology to one who

Digitized by Google

who died in the beginning of the fifth, I shall bethink myself in what terms I may most befittingly address the venerable saint. In the mean time I confine myself to the living. Mr. Tregelles' remark has led me carefully to review all I have said of Dr. Davidson's book in the notice of it which appeared in the *Scottish Congregational Magazine*, and that review satisfies me that there is nothing for which I have to apologize to that gentleman. My notice of his book was, on the whole, a favourable one. I declared it to be 'well deserving of welcome from all who are interested in this important department of inquiry. It is a work,' I went on to say, 'displaying great diligence, supplying a large amount of valuable information, and discussing the questions its author takes up with much fulness and perspicuity. We are far from agreeing with the author in several of his views, but we do not hesitate to say that his work is the most valuable contribution recently made to our theological literature in the department to which it belongs.'[a] Is this, I ask, the language of unfair or ungenerous criticism? Or ought the party who thus freely commended the book to be treated with insult and violence, merely because he stated somewhat strongly his reasons for differing from the author on one point? I cannot believe that Dr. Davidson himself feels that I owe him any apology, or that he will approve of the manner in which I have been treated by Mr. Tregelles. Had he thought that I, either in ignorance or by design, had done him any wrong, I cannot imagine that he knows so little of me as to suppose that I would not have afforded him every facility in my power to set himself right with the readers of the Journal in which the review of his book appeared.

I have now referred to every point in Mr. Tregelles's strictures which I think of any moment. On the general question of the original language of Matthew's Gospel I have not entered, my sole object being to vindicate myself, as the reviewer of Dr. Davidson's Introduction in the Magazine I edit, from the attack of Mr. Tregelles. To the more vituperative parts of that attack I need not trouble myself to reply.

W. Lindsay Alexander.

Pinkieburn, 6th Feb., 1850.

To the Editor of the Journal of Sacred Literature.

My dear Sir,—I have to thank you for the courtesy which you have shown in transmitting to me a copy of the strictures on part of my paper on the 'Original Language of St. Matthew's Gospel.' While I fully appreciate your object, viz., to shorten controversy, by letting any reply appear in the same number of your Journal as the strictures, I beg to assure you that in writing the paper in question, I had (and I intended to be understood as expressing as much) no intention of carrying on a continued controversy (p. 178).

---

[a] *Scottish Congregational Magazine* for Sept. 1849, p. 261.

The

Digitized by Google

The state of the case is not altered by Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander's avowal that he was the writer of the attack on Dr. Davidson and others. I can leave my paper, and Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander's harmless strictures, to the judgment of intelligent readers: such will easily determine whether the simple and straightforward testimony of Jerome (pp. 155, 171) was or was not fairly represented by Dr. W. L. Alexander, and justly ridiculed (p. 170); whether it was logical to infer Dr. W. L. Alexander's *meaning* from his *words*; whether it be sound reasoning to judge of the opinion of the Early Church, as a Church, on the books of Canonical Scripture, from the uncontradicted and unanimous testimony of the individual writers belonging to that Church, in preference to modern surmises; and whether the sentiments of Dr. Davidson and others have been accurately or inaccurately stated (pp. 170, 176).

Dr. W. L. Alexander's case is contained in his original attack and his rejoinder; mine is sufficiently stated in my paper on St. Matthew's Gospel.

S. Prideaux Tregelles.

No. 6, *Portland-square, Plymouth,*
March 2, 1850.

DEFINITIONS OF MIRACLES.

Dear Sir,—Although it may occasionally be an open question whether some particular Scripture narrative does or does not detail a miracle, yet this does not render it the less important to reject loose and vague definitions of what miracles are.

This is the point on which Mr. J. von Gumpach is at issue with many of your readers. He said (Jan. 1849, p. 136): 'Although on the doctrine of miracles it will be difficult for theologians to agree, until they shall have first agreed on the precise nature and the definition of a miracle, yet the two most essential points of that doctrine *are admitted by all.*' He then goes on to say, that the second of these *admitted* points is, '*that the necessary qualification of a miracle is its answering some grand, lasting, and ostensible purpose.*' This is a point which Mr. von Gumpach says is '*admitted by all*;' to his *constat*, I, in common with a large number of Christians and Biblical scholars (*most*, I believe), must answer *non constat*;—his allegation, therefore, that this is *admitted by all*, falls to the ground the moment that it is denied by some. The application, therefore, of this principle as an *admitted point* falls also. It requires to be *proved* that we must inquire with regard to any narration, 'Has the great aim contemplated (*i. e.* of answering some grand, lasting, and ostensible purpose) been accomplished?' The canon has been asserted, but not demonstrated; and thus I cannot admit that, 'If to these questions the context of Scripture returns us no satisfactory answer, it ought to be a proof to us that no miracle is spoken of.'

Digitized by Google

Of course I fully admit that God never suspends the laws of nature by a miracle unless *He* has some end in view worthy of His own wisdom; but it is not for us to say that *we* are capable of understanding apart from His revelation what it has been fitting for *Him* to do or to abstain from doing: none of us can say to Him, 'What doest thou?'

How many even of the miracles of our blessed Lord wrought nothing that was *permanent!* Are they on that account *not miracles?*

I should probably have abstained from addressing you on this point, were it not that Mr. von Gumpach seems to suppose that Mr. Taylor, who has treated the subject with such ability and Christian common sense in your pages, stands alone: so far from this being the case, he is only in precise accordance with Biblical scholars in general, both ancient and modern.

On the question connected with the miracle of Joshua, I do not now enter, farther than to say that it is not disproved because of its not being mentioned in any extant writing from the book of Joshua to that of Ecclesiasticus. It is not by a silence of *this kind* that we disprove Romish additions to Scripture. If a thing be already in the Bible, its not being mentioned by writers for many ages cannot invalidate the fact that it is there. As far as I remember, the ordinance of the Red Heifer is not spoken of from Numbers xix. till Hebrews ix.;—a longer period than from Joshua to Jesus the son of Sirach.

Mr. von Gumpach speaks as though the Hebrew language were not very definitely known. To this I must demur. Did not *Dathe*, *Gesenius*, and *De Wette* understand Hebrew? and yet they, in common with the learned and the unlearned, thought *the words of the passage* in Joshua do intend to speak of a miracle. And so I believe that Hebrew scholars will continue to think, as fully as the mere readers of our English version.

I remember well how twenty years ago or more it was rather customary to explain away Elijah having been fed by *ravens: Arabians*, or the people of *Orbo*, or anything rather than admit a miracle. I have often been *smiled at* for adhering to so old-fashioned an idea as this miracle. I rarely now hear these modes of avoiding the miraculous in the case of Elijah; few writers now advance it, and critics return to the old-fashioned notion. You *in the* '*Pictorial Bible*' have (in common with other critics) well shown that the objections to that being a miracle are utterly futile. Just as transient will be, I expect, the results of the new explanation of the miracle of Joshua.

S. P. T.

Plymouth, March 12, 1850.

NOTICES

Digitized by Google

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

History of the American Bible Society from its Organization to the Present Time. By W. P. Strickland, one of the Society's agents. With an Introduction by the Rev. N. L. Rice, D.D., of Cincinnati. Embellished with a likeness of the Hon. Elias Boudinot, LL.D., first President of the Society. New York, Harper and Brothers; London, S. Low. 1849. Pp. xxx. and 466.

This volume is presented to the public, as already reviewed in the laudatory preface of Dr. Rice, and in the recommendations subjoined to the work.

The author's object avowedly has been to furnish the facts which relate to the American Bible Society; its origin, special objects and field of labour. This leads him to introduce a large number of collateral facts, so that a considerable portion of the volume is occupied with details which do not relate to the American Bible Society in particular, but which are necessary to any comprehensive view of what has been done or is doing in the important work of Bible distribution. We propose noticing particularly those chapters which are most peculiarly American.

Mr. Strickland commences with the condition of the United States prior to the formation of the American Bible Society. The arrival of the 'Pilgrim Fathers' is of course the first event to be noticed: the sketch, however, is so brief that the landing of the Pilgrims, the publication of our Authorized Version of the Bible, and the repeal of the Prohibitions of Henry VIII. on reading the Bible, are brought into curious juxtaposition.

'Seventeen years previous to the landing of the Pilgrims the translation of the Bible by King James had been made; and the edict by Henry VIII., which restricted its reading to royalty, and barred access to all the rest of mankind, was revoked, and the living oracles were opened to all who could procure them.'—p. 18.

On this side the Atlantic many are profoundly ignorant of every thing American, and we fear that some of our Transatlantic brethren are equally ignorant of everything English, so that in reading this passage they may imagine the revocation of the laws of Henry VIII. to have been contemporaneous with the publication of our present version in 1611. What should we then have to say to the whole history of the reign of Edward VI. and of Queen Elizabeth?

The Pilgrim Fathers brought the Bible with them; and though some of the mistakes which they made in attempts at *theocratic* government were indeed remarkable, yet the deep-rooted reverence for the word of God with which their souls were imbued, was manifest in many

Digitized by Google

many ways;—a century and a half ago there existed in some of the colonies laws which *required* every family to be furnished with a Bible. That these laws were ever carried out cannot (we think) be at all supposed.

When the first American Congress met in 1777 (seven years before the acknowledged independence of the Revolutionary States) a memorial was presented on the subject of Bible destitution; in consequence of which a committee was appointed to advise as to printing an edition of the Bible. The destitution was then great not in the United States merely, but in all Christendom: the local laws requiring in some States that every family should possess a copy *must* have been entirely in abeyance. But although the United States wished to print Bibles, there was difficulty in procuring the needful materials—paper and types. An importation was therefore ordered; this however was found almost impracticable from the continuance of the war with Great Britain; and an American edition was printed at Philadelphia in 1781.

After the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1804, various local associations were formed from time to time in different parts of the United States; and hence the suggestion was made in 1814 that one American Bible Society should be organized. A plan for this purpose was prepared by the New Jersey Bible Society in the following year, and in consequence delegates from the then existing Bible Societies were convened at New York in May 1816.

The names of these delegates, and the constitution which they adopted, are given in Mr. Strickland's pages. From the newly-formed society other auxiliary societies soon sprang; and societies which had previously existed united themselves with it.

The number of copies of the Scriptures circulated by this society, up to the end of 1848, amounts to *five millions eight hundred and sixty thousand four hundred and ninety-three*, in upwards of twenty different languages.

The obstacles to Bible circulation in the United States are treated of at some length: Popish influence is one—Popery is there the same as everywhere; another hindrance is one from which (thanks be to God) we are preserved in this country—*Slavery*. Fearful indeed are the consequences which result from slavery in hindering the written revelation of God from reaching the eyes and hearts of those who are in bonds. The following is an extract from a report:—

'The fact seems to be overlooked that those who hold slaves are usually men of property, and could and would purchase books and supply their dependent people, if nothing but money were wanting to effect the object. But there is, as stated, an almost universal inability among slaves to read, *and an indisposition to instruct them equally extensive.*'

What a responsibility! to keep men who need the knowledge of a Saviour in ignorance—to hinder them, as it were, from drinking of the fountain of life!

One of Mr. Strickland's chapters is devoted to a very interesting subject, *The Bible among the Indians;* the aborigines of that land where a Teutonic race have now so fully established themselves. '*The very*

Digitized by Google

very first Bible printed in the American Continent was Eliot's Indian Bible. It was printed at Cambridge, Massachusetts, at the expense of the corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in 1663' (p. 128). The American Bible Society took up the important labour belonging thus especially to its own field; and portions of the Sacred Volume in the dialects of the Delaware, Mohawk, Seneca, Cherokee, Chickasaw, Sioux, Quapaw, Ojibwa, and Chocktaw Indians. May we not hope that the Scriptures thus diffused may be blessed to many amongst the red men, and that the debt of injuries accumulated for ages may, in a sense, be repaid?

'The Bible in Oregon and California' is the subject of the seventeenth chapter. We are not informed whether any of the grants of Bibles for *Oregon* are in the language spoken there by the Indians, but it seems as though the contrary were intended. The church of Rome, however, has had its eye fixed on that country as a sphere of labour amongst the aborigines in their own tongue. We have heard a speech in the Oregon language at the *Propaganda* at Rome, at the 'festival of the kings' (*i. e.* the Epiphany), when the chapel of that institution is made the scene of an extraordinary *Polyglott* exhibition: we heard *fifty* languages in succession. A communication from Oregon is given in the volume before us: the Rev. Mr. Roberts thus acknowledges two boxes of Bibles in 1848:—'Nothing more appropriate was ever brought to Oregon. Romanism, Campbellism, Rationalism, Socinianism, and infidelity, exist here in a state of crudity, waiting only for some moulding influence to fashion them, and bring them forth in all their appalling features.'

Many will be interested to know that *California*, whither so many flock, led by that 'love of money which is the root of all evils,' has not been neglected in the work of Bible distribution: thousands of Bibles and Testaments have of late been sent thither; so that plentiful as is gold in that region, it is said that the Word of God is yet more so; previously, however, eight hundred acres of good land had been given for an English Bible. Some of those who have sought California for worldly gain may there find a better treasure.

The account given of the translations into foreign languages is prefaced with a brief history of the English Bible. Of Coverdale's translation it is said, 'In 1534 Miles Coverdale commenced a translation soon after Tyndale's imprisonment. The work was completed in one year, and dedicated to Henry VIII.' We notice this statement because it is perfectly correct in itself, and also because it has been denied. The proof of its correctness is found in *Coverdale's own statement*, a fact which we think that Mr. Anderson (in his *Annals of the English Bible*) must have overlooked, otherwise he could hardly have gone so far as to ridicule another writer whom he quotes for having stated (to his mind) such an absurdity.

The painful results of the question about Baptism which led to the division in the American Bible Society are of course noticed; into this we cannot enter. Could not some mode of translation have been adopted which would have been unexceptionable?

In

Digitized by Google

In the chapter entitled 'Appeal in behalf of the Bible,' some statistical facts are given which show the field which the American Bible Society has for its home exertions:—

'In Massachusetts...there are hundreds of families unblessed by the light of the written Word. Plymouth County, for ever consecrated as the spot where pilgrim feet were permitted, for the first time, to stand upon a free soil, was explored about three years since, and hundreds of families were found without the Bible. One would think this a fancy sketch, were it not sustained by cold New England facts.'

The destitution in the state of New York is still greater. In the Slave States, of course the negroes are kept destitute of the Scriptures; but this is not all; 'In Western Virginia nearly one-half of the *white* families were without the Bible, and this is put down as a low estimate by those who have made the exploration.' What a picture! How different from what is found in any part of this island!

A very large portion of the volume is occupied with documents, regulations, and statistical details; lists of testators who have left bequests to the society, &c. Several pages are filled with a catalogue of the library of the society; the descriptions of the books, &c., show that the compiler of the list (which we suppose Mr. Strickland to have simply copied) had no great acquaintance with bibliography.

This volume does not appear to assume any literary pretensions; it supplies readers on *this* side the Atlantic with particulars not previously obtainable, relative to American operations, interspersed with general information on the subject of Bible distribution, which contains nothing either original or remarkable: to American readers many of the particulars and other inserted documents must of course possess a much higher value.

General History of the Christian Religion and Church, from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander, translated from the Second and improved Edition by Joseph Torrey, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in the University of Vermont. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark.

It gives us much pleasure to introduce to the notice of our readers the above-mentioned translation of Neander's *History of the Church*, which is now, through the enterprise of the Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh, brought within the easy reach of every one. The volumes were originally published in that excellent series of translations from the German, which, through the now common medium of subscriptions paid in advance, the Messrs. Clark have, for a few years past, been issuing to their subscribers, and which could only be obtained separately by non-subscribers at a two-fold cost. In the present instance that rule has been departed from. Yielding to the very generally expressed desire to obtain the volumes of Neander without being obliged to take the whole series of publications of which they form a part, the Messrs. Clark now offer them to the public at the price paid by the original subscribers; and when we add that the volumes are in no degree inferior to the copies furnished to subscribers, that they are got up in precisely the same style, we cannot for a moment doubt that very many

Digitized by Google

many will acknowledge the liberality of the offer, and hasten to avail themselves of it.

It is often a matter of no less surprise than regret to us that Neander's great work should to so limited an extent form the text-book for students of Church History in this country. Of course the work is known to every scholar, and wherever it is known it is appreciated, but it cannot yet be said to be in general use. It has not displaced Mosheim from the hands of those who wish to study both the lights and shadows of the Church's chequered course, nor Milner from the hands of those who love to follow her only amidst those scenes where she proved herself a true Messenger from Heaven. From these imperfect works it is that almost all the ordinary knowledge of Church History in this country is drawn, and to nearly all who do not make this important branch not merely of theological, but of general education, their *study*, the rich stores, the comprehensive views, and the glowing pictures of Neander are unknown. Conservatism, driven from every other refuge, seems not only resolved but able to make good her ground on the field of knowledge, and works, which the more advanced scholarship of the Continent has left behind for half a century, are only renewing their youth in the shape of cheap editions amongst ourselves. We are not insensible to that amount of *dictionary* value which Mosheim possesses, and when the spirit is weary it often does us good to take an hour's refreshment in the pages of the pious Milner; but he who would estimate aright the position and the progress of Christianity in the world, who would understand the numberless influences by which it has been acted on from without, as well as the power which it has exerted in return, who would have his thoughts elevated to behold in it that 'leaven which leaveneth the whole lump,' and who would learn to anticipate, from what it has done, the glory of its final triumph, must mark its history as developed by Neander's skilful hand.

Most of our readers do not know Neander; if they did, they would never rest till they knew his works. Let them imagine to themselves a man of, in many respects, unprepossessing appearance, neither tall nor stout, with an ill-made body wrapped in an ill-made coat, no handsome features in the countenance, no commanding brow, no sparkling eyes, but eyes hardly visible under their large and shaggy eyebrows; let them imagine that they know him, with all his diminutive appearance, to be a man of extraordinary attainments, versed in the philosophical speculations of his own country, able even to converse with ease in most of the languages, whether of ancient or of modern Europe, learned in the theologies of the world: let them imagine, notwithstanding that, when they see him, they can neither think of being emboldened by his bodily appearance, nor of being awed by his mental power, but are at once warmed and won by the genuine simplicity of his character, by the kindliness of his heart, and the depth of those Christian convictions which are to him his very breath of life, and they will form some idea of the impression which he would make on them. Let them further imagine that they hear him lecture, hear him pour forth, with hardly even notes before him, his, like his country's own river,

Digitized by Google

river, 'exulting and abounding stream;' mark the emotion too deep for tears with which he traces the trials of the good of every age, and describes the victory of faith; see the enlargement, the spirituality, the Christian freedom of his views—and we are much mistaken if one of them could be content without forming an intimate acquaintance with that work to which he has devoted the labours of his life.

Neander is himself a man to whom his Christianity is his very life; and the peculiar service which he has rendered to Church History is this, that he has seen Christianity to be the life of the world. To him it is not so much a system of doctrines, it is a real substantive power—the 'power of God' in the hearts and lives of men—that power which is destined gradually to subdue all things to itself, until the whole world is leavened, and the kingdoms of the earth are become 'the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.' As he says himself in his introductory remarks,—

'In Christianity we recognize a power not born from the concealed depths of human nature, but springing from heaven which has opened itself to alienated humanity—a power which, elevated in its being as well as in its origin above all that human nature by any means of its own could produce, is rather to communicate to it new life, and remodel it from its very foundations. The source of this power is He, in whose life its appearance is presented to us—Jesus of Nazareth, the Redeemer of mankind, separated from God by sin.'

It is to this view of his subject more especially that we owe those many valuable chapters wherein the devotional life of the Church in different eras is presented to us, as well as those interesting monographies where some distinguished individual is viewed, not merely as he is in himself, but as the representative of the religious tendencies of his age. By this it is too that we always feel ourselves, in reading Neander, not dealing with abstractions, but with living and life-giving realities.

Of the mere amount of learning and research displayed in the volumes we think it quite unnecessary to say a word.

It is necessary to bear in mind in studying Neander the circumstances under which he writes, the feelings of his own country so different from those of ours, and those many controversies in which it is absolutely necessary for a German historian to take a part. Perhaps few things have more repelled the English reader from his pages than those long discussions about the Gnostics to which he is so early introduced. Yet this is one of the most valuable portions of the work, though a very great part of it is called forth by views peculiar to some German writers, and which are almost entirely unknown in this country. May we long be ignorant of them!

Were our object at present to discuss Neander's merits as a historian, we might feel ourselves called upon to take exception to some things, such as for example his too great *subjectivity*, but we have said enough for the present. Our object is rather earnestly to press the study of his work upon all who wish to become acquainted with that most interesting of all histories, the History of the Church of Christ, and for this purpose to commend to our readers the translation named at the head

Digitized by Google

head of these remarks. The translation is excellent, the first four volumes being reprinted from the American translation by Professor Torrey, and the fifth volume being translated by Dr. Stebbing. The whole is translated from the second edition of the original, the last, we regret to think, which the age of its distinguished author gives us any reason to hope he will himself be able to revise.

Daily Bible Illustrations; being Original Readings for a Year, on Subjects from Sacred History, Biography, Geography, Antiquities, and Theology, especially arranged for the Family Circle. By John Kitto, D.D., F.S.A., &c. ANTEDILUVIANS and PATRIARCHS: January—March. Edinburgh: Wm. Oliphant and Sons. 1850.

WE can make no apology to the readers of this Journal for the following remarks on a new publication by its Editor. We are solely responsible for all the sentiments of our critique; and we will not offend Dr. Kitto's sensitive delicacy by any fulsome eulogies or indiscriminate laudations; we only write our own sincere and independent convictions.

The industry of Dr. Kitto is to be admired. In one form or other he is constantly adding to our stock of Biblical literature. Varying forms and styles of composition are assumed, according to the end he has proposed. His book in course of publication differs in some important respects from his former efforts. It is less exclusive in its range of subjects, and will command a wider circle of readers. Dr. Kitto comes down from the high and distant paths of Biblical science, and mingles freely in their homes and in their hearths with the numerous students whom these attractive volumes will draw around him. His object is to present the results of sound erudition, patient research, and personal travel in such a way as to interest and profit the million, who cannot spend time over bulky cyclopædias and prolific commentaries. Great success has attended the labours of wise and patriotic men in popularising common science; sheets of useful knowledge are wafted in thousands by every breeze; why should not the higher department of Biblical and theological lore be brought down to the 'business and bosom' of the inquiring and intelligent Christian disciple. Let him know all he can, and add to his 'faith knowledge;' let him see apposite illustrations taken from 'Manners' or Geography; let him wonder at new proofs of integrity and authenticity in those statutes which are the 'men of his counsels;' let him gaze on Nineveh, Babylon, and Egypt, offering monumental homage to Moses and the prophets,—and is he not prepared and disciplined for arriving all the sooner at the 'riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, of the Father, and of Christ?'

Dr. Kitto has, in this instance, adopted a wise and peculiar method of imparting his instructions. The book is correctly named 'Daily Bible Illustrations.' The author's reflections are based, indeed, upon consecutive portions of the narration; but his theme is sometimes a marvellous incident, a pregnant expression, a significant ceremony, a name

Digitized by Google

name suggestive of character, a place enveloped with sacred associations, or some custom peculiar to former ages and Eastern lands. This plan relieves the treatise of the formality and dulness which often belong to continuous expositions. For example, under 'Seventh Week,' we have marked as themes—

God's Purposes and Man's Devices.
Patriarchal Wealth.
The Jews.
The First War.
Kings and Kingdoms—Melchizedec.
The Covenant.
Slaves.

Practical piety, the great end of all, is not forgotten in these daily exercises. To this issue all the thoughts, remarks, and inferences are directed, as if headed by the apostolical motto, 'that ye also may have fellowship with us, and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.' The 'Readings' for the first day of the week are selected with careful regard to the delightful and refreshing services and meditations of the holy Sabbath. Thus the interests of the heart are not merged in the claims of the intellect; the inner life is nurtured with that appropriate aliment which the Divine Spirit has so richly and generously provided for it.

Dr. Kitto has, in our opinion, succeeded well in his endeavour. We should imagine that an ordinary reader will find his way through the volume, not only without fatigue, but with growing delight and attachment. The style is easy and vigorous, and the pictorial illustrations are in general tasteful and accurate. To find fault we will not, amidst so much to please and benefit. We trust that many a family circle will enliven its evening hours with these striking and impressive papers, so full of instructive material, happily expressed and arranged.

More we might have said, but less we could not say; for we hold that no man on becoming an editor foregoes the rights or privileges of an ordinary author—the common claim of having any of his literary productions noticed even in a journal conducted by himself. A man does not forfeit his civic franchise when his name is inscribed as a senator on the roll of St. Stephen's.

JOHN EADIE.

43, *Cambridge Street, Glasgow.*

*** From the press of other matter, some Reviews and many Notices of Books have been omitted from the present Number; but the next will be largely occupied with them.

BIBLICAL
Digitized by Google

BIBLICAL INTELLIGENCE.

A new edition of the *Lectures on Biblical Criticism* of Dr. Samuel Davidson is in preparation: this will in fact be a new Book, the whole being re-written, and a systematic view of the science accurately presented according to the most recent investigations.—*Publisher's Circular.*

Messrs. Longmans announce for publication a work of the Rev. F. C. Cooke, M.A., *On the Acts of the Apostles*, 'with Notes for readers and students of the Bible.' The notes are intended to present the results of the most important works on the Acts that have appeared in this country and on the Continent, in a condensed and intelligible form.

Mr. Sampson Low announces *Light in Dark Places; or, Memorials of Christian Life in the Middle Centuries*, from the German of Neander, probably an American translation.

The *Sketches of Travels in Egypt and the Holy Land*, by the Rev. J. A. Spencer, M.A., published by Mr. Murray, is a simultaneous production of a work published in America recently, by an Episcopal clergyman, known as *The New Testament in Greek, with English Notes.* It has been issued too late for our notice in the present Number, but it is intended to examine this, together with other recent works on the Holy Land, in our next publication.

The long-continued flow of Apocalyptic publications has now somewhat abated, and it is intended to take advantage of the interval to give our readers a collective account of Recent Apocalyptic Literature in the next Number.

The publication of a complete edition of the works of Dr. Owen, in fifteen octavo vols., will be commenced early in June, by Messrs. Johnstone and Hunter. It is to be published on the plan now coming much into vogue—of a materially lower price to early subscribers. This is understood to be the commencement of a cheap library edition of the complete works of our most distinguished English divines.

The Hulsean prize of the present year has been gained by the Rev. Samuel Tomkins, M.A., formerly classical tutor of Stepney Baptist College, now of Catherine Hall, Cambridge. The subject is, 'On the Use, by Heathen Authors, of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures.'

Bodleian Library.—From a catalogue of books purchased for the Library during the year ending November 8, 1849, it appears that several important and curious acquisitions have been made to it. Among these are the valuable collection of Sanscrit MSS. formed by the Rev. Dr. Mill (now Professor of Hebrew at Cambridge) during his residence in India, in number 160. A catalogue of these is preparing.

The *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, an able German periodical, partly religious, which has been published for sixty-five years, under the able editorial charge of successive professors of Halle, was discontinued in December last.

Dr. Neander is engaged on the volume of Church History which embraces the period from A.D. 1308 to 1517.

The Church History of Professor Karl Hase of Jena has been translated from the German by Professor Blumenthal and the Rev. C. P. Wing, and is announced for speedy publication in the United States.

Digitized by Google We

We learn from our German correspondent, that the recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the question between the Bishop of Exeter and Mr. Gorham, has attracted much attention in Germany, and it is understood that the Rev. Th. Baltzer (formerly a Roman Catholic Professor at Breslau, and now astor at Naumburg—one of the leading men among the Deutsch-Catholiken) is preparing a work, suggested thereby, under the title *Ein Glaubens Gericht in der Mitte des* 19 *Jahrhunderts, als Beitrag zur Reform des protestantischen Kirchenwesens.*

Professor Fricke is engaged in writing a *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, of which the first part is understood to be already in the press.

Professor Thenius has in the press an exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings, under the title *Die Bücher der Könige exegetisch bearbeitet von Prof. Thenius.*

Of Hagenbach's *Kirchengeschichte* a second edition is in the press; and of the work *Ueber die zu Kunst der evangelischen Kirchen*, which has attracted much attention in Germany, another edition (the *third*) is in preparation.

The Rev. Th. Kaufmann is about to publish a work that promises to be very interesting—*Die Entwickelung der Gottesidee. Mit einem Vorwort: die Kunst und die Aesthetik.*

The Rev. Henry Burgess, late of Luton, is engaged in an examination of the Syriac translation of Chrysostom's Homilies in the British Museum, especially its numerous Scripture quotations, for purposes bearing on Biblical criticism. He is also preparing a Translation of the Festal Letters of Athanasius, recently discovered in a Syriac Translation, the Greek text having long been lost. The Syriac text has been published by the Rev. W. Cureton, to whom this branch of learning is so greatly indebted.

Although the following paragraph refers to a valued Contributor to this Journal, the testimonial to Biblical literature which it embodies demands for it a place in our pages:—

'We are glad to learn that the University of St. Andrew's has conferred the degree of LL.D. on Mr. Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. Mr. Tregelles has long been known to Biblical scholars as an indefatigable labourer in the field of textual criticism. He is the translator of the Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon of Gesenius, published by the Messrs. Bagster. We are also indebted to his labours for an exceedingly able translation of the Book of Revelation from the ancient Greek Text, every word of which is supported by the oldest MSS. now extant. But the work to which Mr. Tregelles has devoted himself for many years past is a new edition of the Greek text of the whole New Testament. In the preparation of this work no expense of time or labour has been spared; the oldest and best MSS. in this country and on the Continent have been collated; all that skill could devise and unwearied industry execute has been brought to bear upon this one point, "to exhibit the text of the New Testament, as nearly as possible, in the very words in which it was written by holy men of God, inspired by the Holy Ghost." With Dr. Tregelles for editor, and the Messrs. Bagster for publishers, we confidently expect in this forthcoming work a permanent addition to our Sacred Literature. It was to mark their sense of the importance and value of his labours, and to cheer and encourage him in his arduous toils, that the University of St. Andrew's conferred this degree upon Dr. Tregelles—a degree which they confer on very rare occasions, and then only upon individuals of sterling and acknowledged merit. We know not which party is most honoured, the scholar who receives, or the university which confers a degree under circumstances such as these.'—*The Edinburgh Witness*, Feb. 16, 1850.

Digitized by Google

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

ENGLISH.

Calvin (J.)—The Life of John Calvin; compiled from Authentic Sources, and particularly from his Correspondence. By Thomas H. Dyer. 8vo. pp. 572.

Da Costa (Dr. I.)—Israel and the Gentiles. Contributions to the History of the Jews, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. Post 8vo. pp. 640.

Fiske (Rev. E. F.)—The Respective Peculiarities in the Creeds of the Mahometan and the Hindu which stand in the way of Conversion to the Christian Faith: an Essay. 8vo. Cambridge. pp. 160.

Hussey (Rev. R.)—Sermons, mostly Academical; with a Preface, containing a Refutation of the Theory founded upon the Syriac Fragments of the Epistles of St. Ignatius. 8vo. pp. 226.

Neander (A.)—General History of the Christian Religion and Church, from the German of Dr. Augustus Neander. Translated by Rev. Henry Stebbing, D.D. Vol. V. 8vo. pp. 366. (Clark's Foreign and Theological Library, Vol. XV.)

Olshausen (H.)—Biblical Commentary on the Gospels; adapted especially for Preachers and Students. By Hermann Olshausen, D.D. Translated from the German by Rev. Thomas Brown and Rev. John Gill. Vol. III. 8vo. pp. 568. (Clark's Foreign and Theological Library, Vol. XVI.)

Scudamore (W. E.)—An Essay on the Office of the Intellect in Religion; with especial Reference to the Evidences of a Revelation, and the Proof of Christian Doctrine. By William Edward Scudamore. 8vo. pp. 304.

Salmon (Rev. G.)—The Propriety of Prayer for Temporal Blessings; preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, Nov. 15, 1849. 8vo. (Dublin) pp. 44.

Woodhouse (G. W.)—The Church of England; her Fidelity to the Truth, and her Efficiency for Good; preached at the Consecration of St. Matthew's Church, Wolverhampton, Nov. 21, 1849. By the Rev. G. W. Woodhouse, M.A. 8vo. pp. 16.

Kitto (Dr. J.)—Daily Bible Illustrations; being Original Readings for a Year on Subjects from Sacred History, Biography, Geography, Antiquities, and Theology, especially designed for the Family Circle. Antediluvians and Patriarchs, Jan. to March. 12mo. pp. 480.

Schumann (A.)—An Introduction to the Books of the Old and New Testament. By A. Schumann. Translated from the German by the Author of 'People's Dictionary of the Bible.' 8vo. pp. 348.

Crosby (A.)—The Second Advent; or, What do the Scriptures teach respecting the Second Coming of Christ. 12mo. (Boston, U.S.) pp. 184.

M'Cosh (Rev. J.)—The Method of the Divine Government, Physical and Moral. By the Rev. James M'Cosh. 8vo. (Edinburgh), pp. 560.

Read (Rev. H.)—The Hand of God in History; or, Divine Providence historically illustrated in the Extension and Establishment of Christianity. Post 8vo. (Hartford), pp. 404.

Bryce (J.)—Ten Years of the Church of Scotland, from 1833 to 1843; with Historical Retrospect from 1560. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 480.

Eastern Churches; containing Sketches of the Nestorian, Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, and Abyssinian Communities. Post 8vo. pp. 124.

Humphrey (Rev. W. G.)—The Doctrine of a Future State; in Nine Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in the Year 1849, at the Lecture founded by the Rev. John Hulse. 8vo. pp. 296.

Jerusalem (The) Remembrancer; or, the Daily Thoughts of a Year during a Residence in Jerusalem. 12mo. pp. 274.

M'Caul (Rev. Dr. A.)—Thoughts on Rationalism, Revelation, and the Divine Authority of the Old Testament. To which is added, the State of Christianity in Germany, by Professor Quinet; translated from the French. Fcp. 8vo. pp. 166.

Thomson (Rev. P.)—The Soul, its Nature and Destinies. 12mo. pp. 246.

Worsley (T.)—The Province of the Intellect in Religion, deduced from Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, and considered with reference to Prevalent Errors: Book V. The Patriarchs. 8vo. pp. 276.

Haslam

Digitized by Google

Haslam (Rev. W.)—The Cross and the Serpent; being a Brief History of the Triumph of the Cross through a long Series of Ages, in Prophecy, Types, and Fulfilment. 12mo. pp. 286.

'It is Written Again;' or, a Help to a Corrected and Harmonized Reading of the Scriptures. 8vo. pp. 64.

Keith (Rev. A.)—Isaiah, as it is; or Judah and Jerusalem the Subjects of Isaiah's Prophesying. By the Rev. Alex. Keith. Post 8vo. pp. 682.

Mahan (Rev. A.)—Lectures on the Ninth of Romans; Election, and the Influence of the Holy Spirit. 12mo. pp. 182.

FOREIGN.

Librorum symbolicorum Ecclesiae orientalis Appendix. Ex schedis posthumis E. J. Kimmil, ed. H. J. C. Weissenborn. Insunt: Metrophanis Critopuli Confessio, Decretum. Synodi Constantinopolitanae anni 1672. Index. 8vo. (Jenae.)

Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae orientalis. Primum in unum corpus collegit variantes lectiones ad fidem optimorum exemplorum adnotavit prolegomena addidit indice rerum praecipuarum instruxit E. J. Kimmel. Accedit appendix ex schedis editoris posthumis edita à H. J. Chr. Weissenborn. 2 Partes, 8vo. (Jenae.)

Stier (R.)—Jesaias, nicht Pseudo-Jesaias. Auslegung seiner Weissagung Kap. 40—66. Nebst Einleitung wider die Pseudo-Kritik. Vol. I. 8vo. (Barmen.)

Thenius (O.)—Exegetisches Handbuch zu d. Büchern d. Könige. Nebst Anhang das vorexilische Jerusalem u. dessen Tempel. 8vo. (Leipz.)

Lepsius (R.)—Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien. 4to. (Berlin.)

Creuzer (F.)—Religions et l'Antiquité, considérées principalement dans leurs formes symboliques et mythologiques. Traduit de l'Allemand, refondu en partie, complété et développé par J. D. Guigniault. Tome 2me, 3me partie, ou 2me partie, 2me section. 8vo.

Lutz (J. L.)—Biblische Hermeneutik. Nach dessen Tode, herausgegeben von Adolph Lutz. 8vo. (Pforzheim).

Weigl (J. B.)—Theologisch-chronologische Abhandlung üb. das wahre Geburts-u. Sterb-Jahr. Jesu Christi. Vol. II. 4to. (Sulzb.)

*** Although the names of the Contributors to this Journal are no longer given in connection with their articles, the publication still remains an organ for the *discussion* of subjects in Sacred Literature. The views advanced will thus necessarily vary, and are to be regarded as those of the several writers; the Editor not being held responsible for every opinion and argument, but only for the general adaptation of the article to the design of the Journal.

ERRATA.

Vol. IV. p. 198, for *Latin Vulgate* read *Latin Versions.*
„ V. p. 46, line 31, for ταύτας read ταύτας.
„ „ 196, line 32, for *special* read *spacial.*
„ „ 198, line 9, for לִילָה read לֵילָה.
„ „ „ „ 10, for *past* read *post.*
„ „ „ „ 23, for וְלֹא read וְלֹא.
„ „ „ „ 30, for *puts in* read *puts it in.*

*** *The Title-page and Index of the Fifth Volume will be given with the next Number.*

Digitized by Google

INDEX

TO THE

FIFTH VOLUME OF THE JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE.

A.

ANTAR—ILLUSTRATIONS OF SCRIPTURE FROM THE ANCIENT BEDOUIN ROMANCE OF THAT NAME, 1–35; substantial identity of the ancient and existing customs of the Arab tribes, 1; 'Antar' describes Arabian manners before Mohammed, 2; object of this article to produce illustrations of Scripture from 'Antar,' 2; Assmai the principal author of this romance, 2; Antar and Mamun, 3, 4; brilliant period described in 'Antar,' 5; places named from 'Antar,' 7; character as a poem, 8; reason why so long unknown to European Orientalists, 10; Mr. Hamilton's translation, 11, 12; illustrations from the usages of war, 13; crime of erecting an altar similar to the sacred altar at Mecca, 16; nuptial customs, 18; illustrations from Antar's early history as the son of a female slave, 20–28; Antar's combat with a lion, 28; his love, 30–33; his valour and filial respect, 33; he delivers the prince, and is highly honoured by King Zoheir, 35.

Assmai, author of 'Antar,' 2.

B.

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD, 396–414; variety of opinion, 396; not instead of unbaptized dead, nor does it refer to washings for the dead, 397; nor to those baptized after martyrdom of others, nor does it mean for Christ who is dead, 398; 'baptism of suffering and death' the true meaning, 403; proof of this, 403–412; free translation of the whole passage, 413.

Bar Chochebas, the pseudo-Messiah, 374, 375.

Bartolocci's collation of the Codex Vaticanus (B), 37.

Bayer, Hartmann, opposes Theobald Thamer, 132.

Ben Gabirol, 380, 391.

Ben Jacob Alphes, Rabbi Isaac, 392, 393.

Bentley's collation of the Codex Vaticanus (B), 37.

Bible of Every Land noticed, 243, 244.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM, FIRST LESSONS IN, No. 1—Preliminary Remarks, 415–422; this series meant for general readers or young students, 415; object to investigate subjects of previous inquiry regarding the books of Scripture, 416; as Genuineness, Authenticity, and Canonical Authority of the Books; Determination of the Text; Principles of Interpretation of the Text, 418; general observations, 418–422.

BIBLICAL INTELLIGENCE, 248–250, 521, 522.

BIBLICAL LECTURES, POPULAR, 422–436; efforts for the improvement of young men, 422; defect of Mechanics' Institutes, Mr. Purdy's prize essay censured, 424; great value of Christian associations for the improvement of young men, 425; this Society's plan resembles that of our Journal, 427; Mr. Stowell's lecture, 429; Dr. M'Neile's, 431; Mr. Hamilton's, 434.

Bibliotheca Sacra, Strictures on, 178, 179.

Birch's collation of the Codex Vaticanus (B), 39.

Butler's *Analogy* criticised, 468–475.

Digitized by Google

C.

Chalmers' *Posthumous Works* noticed, 233–239.

CORRESPONDENCE: J. G. Murphy on Hebrew Tenses, 194–202; J. Von Gumpach on the Miracle of Joshua, 225–231; Rev. P. Mearns on Burial with Christ by Baptism, 231, 232; Reconsidered Texts, No. 1, Rom. ix. 3, 495–499; Dr. W. L. Alexander's strictures on article by Dr. S. P. Tregelles, 499-510; Dr. Tregelles' Reply, 510. 511; Dr. Tregelles on Definitions of Miracles, 511, 512.

CREATION, ON THE MOSAIC ACCOUNT OF THE, 186–194; assumed principles, 186; matter produced long before the operations of the six days, 187; day of 24 hours, 187; notes on the recorded operations of the six days, 187–193; concluding reflections, 193.

Cureton's *Corpus Ignatianum* reviewed, 339–373; his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*, 355.

D.

Denzinger on the Ignatian Epistles, 363.

De Wette, Dr. W. M. L., notice of his death, 249.

Dschohaina, 2.

E.

Ebn Ezra, 385–387.

Edinburgh Review, article in, examined, 456–491.

English Review on the Ignatian Epistles, 354.

Epiphanius on the Hebrew of Matthew's Gospel, 154.

G.

Gaussen's *Theopneustia* censured, 463.

H.

Hades, 83.

Hallevi, Rabbi Jehuda, his poem 'Sion,' 375, 383.

Hamilton's *Literary Attractions of the Bible* reviewed, 434–436.

Hamilton's (Mr. T.) Translation of 'Antar,' 2, 11, 12.

Harting's *Quæstionem de Marcione* noticed, 245, 246.

HEBREW POETRY OF THE MIDDLE AGES, 373–395; grandeur of inspired poetry —Professor Monk's Essay, 373; poem for 9th of Ab, 374—entitled 'Sion,' by Rabbi Jehuda Hallevi, 375; pretensions and fate of Bar Chochebas, 374, 375; Maimonides, 378; Rabbi Al-Charisi complained of the Jews adopting a foreign language, 379; poems of Ben Gabirol, 380; Jewish schools and colleges—learned men and poets, 382; Rabbi Isaac—Hallevi, 383; 'Al-Charizi's Art of Poetry,' 384; Ebn Ezra's romantic marriage, 385, 386; his travels and writings, 387; Maimonides not a poet, 388; Kimchi, 388; 'Gan Eden,' Rieti, Professor Lozati, 389; Rabbi Isaac Ben Jacob Alphes, 392; Judith's Ode, 394, 395.

Hug on the original of Matthew's Gospel, 159.

Hussey on the Epistles of Ignatius, 365.

I.

IGNATIAN EPISTLES, 339–373; valuable labours of Mr. Cureton, 339; three collections of these Epistles, 340; their literary history, 340–343; discovery of the Syriac version, 344; MSS. used for the *Corpus Ignatianum*, 346; genuineness of the Epistles, 346; specimens of hierarchic tone, 350, 351; features of the Curetonian text, 352; groundless charges of the *English Review*, 354; and of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Journal*, 356; Petermann's edition of these epistles, 361; Mr. Hussey on the same, 365–368; evidence in favour of three epistles, 368–372.

INSPIRATION OF THE AUTHORS OF THE SCRIPTURES, 437–495; object twofold —to expose the proofless common theory, and to disprove it, 437; maxims of Locke and Chillingworth, 439; inspiration extended only to *religious truth*, 440; 2 Tim. iii. 16 examined, 440; passages in John xiv.-xvi., 442; Luke's introduction, 446; Inspiration not *superintendence*, 447; general principles, 447–453; instances of error in the Bible, 453-456; argument for *plenary theory* in *Edinburgh Review*, 456–459; remarks on this, 459–491; Gaussen's *Theopneustia* censured, 463; Butler's *Analogy* criticised, 468–475; M'Combie quoted with approbation, 481; notes to the Essay on Reason and Faith criticised, 491–495.

Irenæus on the Hebrew of Matthew's Gospel, 152.

Digitized by Google

Irish Ecclesiastical Journal on the Ignatian Epistles, 356.

J.

Jazeemah, King of the tribe of Abs, 13.
Jerome on the Hebrew of Matthew's Gospel, 154.
Jewish Missionary noticed, 246–248.
JOSEPHUS, RESTORATION OF THE CHRONOLOGY OF, 60–81; ancient writings liable to corruption in transmission, 60; care of Josephus in regard to Chronology—his double line of dates, 61; the ten passages containing his principal chronological references, 62; from schism under Rehoboam to the destruction of Jerusalem 370½ years—this a key, 63; 592 years from Exodus to foundation of the temple, 65; two inexplicable dates, 70; results of inquiry into the civil chronology, 74; eight passages with dates, 74, 75; remarks on them, 75–81; tabular view of the 'Sacred Series' of dates as compared with the 'Civil Series,' 81.
JOSHUA, INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOK OF (by Dr. K. F. Keil), Part II., 96–117; date not after the exile, 96; prior to David, 98; proof of a contemporaneous date, 104; controverted, 108; credibility of the book, 109; Israelites' title to Canaan, 114; exegetical helps, 116.
Justin Martyr on the worship of the early Christians, 180.
JUSTIN MARTYR, THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF, 253–301; Sichem his birthplace, 254; education, 254, 255; embraces Christianity, 256; his works—his martyrdom, 256–258; notice of his *First Apology*, 258–268; his *Second Apology*, 268–270; his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*—its genuineness, 271; outline of it with extracts, 271–285; *Oration to the Greeks*, 285; *Exhortation to the Greeks*, 286–290; *Fragment on the Resurrection*, 290–293; dialogue with Trypho his great work, 293; his theological errors, 295; his merits as a writer, 298–301.

K.

Keil's (Dr. K. F.) Introduction to the Book of Joshua, 96–117.
Kimchi, Rabbi David, 388.
Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations* noticed, 519.

L.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS, 251, 252, 523, 524.

M.

M'Combie's article in No. III. of the Journal quoted from, 481.
M'Neile's *Lecture on the Bible* reviewed, 431–434.
Maimonides, 388.
Mamun, the khalif, 2.
MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, ON THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF SAINT, with reference to Davidson's Introduction (by S. P. Tregelles), 151–186; evidence of ancient writers—Papias—Irenæus, 151; Pantænus—Origen, 153; Epiphanius—Jerome, 154; ancient testimony decides in favour of a Hebrew original, 157; evidence of a Greek original, 158; plan of proof needed—plan followed by the learned, 158; Hug merges all evidence into that of Papias—no proof, 159; 'Gospel according to the Hebrews,' 161; not confounded with Matthew's Hebrew Gospel, 162; the present Greek unlike a translation, 163; early versions made from the *Gospel-collection*, 164; *à priori* argument refuted, 164; authorities for the Hebrew and Greek original respectively, 168; theory of a twofold original, 169; strictures on the *Scottish Congregational Magazine*, 170–178; on *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 176; authority of the Greek Gospel as an inspired translation, 179; Justin Martyr on the worship of the early Christians, 180; editorial note, 186.
Melanchthon's opinion of Theobald Thamer, 149.
MISCELLANEA, 203–224; Remarks on Hebrews xiii. 7–16, 203–209; Remarks on Rom. ix. 3, by D. D., 209–215; Biblical Truth, Tested and Justified, No. 1, by J. F., 215–221; Herod 'the Great,' or Herod 'the Elder,' by A. B., 221–223; the mark upon Cain, 223, 224.

N.

Neander's *General History of the Church* noticed, 516.
Neander's (Dr. A.) Theobald Thamer, 117–150.
NOTICES OF BOOKS, 233–248, 513–520.

Digitized by Google

O.

Obeide, Ibn, 2–4.
Origen on the Hebrew of Matthew's Gospel, 153.

P.

Pantænus on the Hebrew of Matthew's Gospel, 153.
Papias on the Original Language of Matthew's Gospel, 151.
Paradise, 87.
Pearson, Bishop, falsely charged with Socinian Views, 360.
Peter's (the Apostle) Residence in Rome, 302–338; bearing of the First Epistle of Peter on this subject, 303; time of this epistle, 304, 314; 'Church at Babylon'—not Rome, 306; certain that Peter preached and was crucified at Rome, 316–318; testimony of Eusebius, 319; controverted, 321–323; Peter not in Rome before A.D. 61, 324; nor before 63—nor could he have laboured there more than one year, 325; claim of primacy for Peter groundless, 327–338.
Petermann's edition of the Ignatian Epistles, 361.
Philip, Landgrave, his kind efforts to recover Thamer, 144–150.
Purdy's prize essay on 'Knowledge among the Middle and Working Classes' censured, 424.

R.

Right of the Israelites to Canaan—What? 114.
Robab, queen of the tribe of Reeyan, 13.
Rogers' Essay on *Reason and Faith*, Notes to, criticised, 491–495.

S.

Scottish Congregational Magazine, Strictures on, 170–178.
Separate State, on the, 82–95; the happy state of the righteous betwixt death and the resurrection might be inferred, 82; remarks on texts which teach it—Luke xvi. 19–31. 83; Hades and Sheol, 83–89; paradise in two texts, 89, 90; notice of 2 Cor. v. 1–9, 92; 1 Thess. iv. 13–18, 93; Heb. xii. 1.
Shedad, the father of Antar, 20, 23.
Sheol, 83.
Stowell's *Bible Self-Evidential*, reviewed, 429–431.
Strickland's *History of the American Bible Society* noticed, 513.
Stuart's *History of the Old Testament Canon* (by Davidson) noticed, 239–243.

T.

'Tales of the Thousand and One Nights,' 5.
Theobald Thamer; an Historical Monograph (by Dr. A. Neander), 117–150; preface, 117; history discovers to us the germs of revolutions, 117; Thamer before his age—his birth, studies, teaching, professorship, 119; his Exhortation to the Study of Theology, 120; necessity of natural science in interpretation of the Bible, 121; excessive zeal—allegorizing interpretations, 122; extremes, 123, 124; he assails the Lutheran system of doctrine, 126; his unpopularity as a preacher, 132; controversy with Hartmann Bayer, 132; three witnesses—Scripture, conscience, and the creatures, 133; his view of conscience, 134; inspiration of Aristotle, 138; twofold stand-point, 138; he opposes doctrine of hereditary depravity and justification by faith, 141; epistolary correspondence with Landgrave Philip, 145–149; Melanchthon's opinion of Thamer, 149; various changes—death, 150.
Tregelles, Dr. S. P., his article on the Original Language of St. Matthew's Gospel, 151–186.
Tischendorf's Greek Testament, 35–60; object of this second notice, 35; notice of MSS., 36; collations of Bartolocci, Bentley, and Birch, 37; Codex Ephraemi (C), 41; Tischendorf's 'Monumenta Sacra Inedita,' 44; Moscow MSS., 48; Codices Claromontanus, San-Germanensis, Augiensis, and Boernerianus, 49; Versions, 51; Value of Tischendorf's *Text*, 53; textual criticism as affecting important passages, 58, 59.

W.

Wines, Oriental, 32.

END OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

OCT 21 1929

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google